A Story of Church Unity

Ex Libris
Robt McNamara
Re'd Jan... 1945

PUBLISHED ON THE FOUNDATION
ESTABLISHED IN MEMORY OF
JAMES WESLEY COOPER
OF THE CLASS OF 1865, YALE COLLEGE

A Story of Church Unity

Including

The Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops

and the

Congregational-Episcopal Approaches

By Newman Smyth, D.D.

New Haven · Yale University Press
London · Humphrey Milford · Oxford University Press
Mdccccxxiii

Copyright, 1923, by Yale University Press

THE JAMES WESLEY COOPER MEMORIAL PUBLICATION FUND

The present volume is the seventh work published by the Yale University Press on the James Wesley Cooper Memorial Publication Fund. This Foundation was established March 30, 1918, by a gift to Yale University from Mrs. Ellen H. Cooper in memory of her husband, Rev. James Wesley Cooper, D.D., who died in New York City, March 16, 1916. Dr. Cooper was a member of the Class of 1865, Yale College, and for twenty-five years pastor of the South Congregational Church of New Britain, Connecticut. For thirty years he was a corporate member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and from 1885 until the time of his death was a Fellow of Yale University, serving on the Corporation as one of the Successors of the Original Trustees.

Contents

	Preface	5
I.	Initial Steps	7
II.	Appeal for a Joint Commission of Chaplains in War Times	15
III.	The Next Step	26
IV.	The Action of the Episcopal Convention on the Concordat	35
V.	The Lambeth Appeal	41
VI.	The Psychological Factor	52
VII.	Three Practical Proposals	62
VIII.	The Providential Training of Congregationalism To Become a Maker of Peace	65
IX.	Keeping by Giving	69
X.	A Personal Word to My Brethren of the Congregational Ministry	71
Appendix:		
I.	A Preliminary Statement of a Joint Conference at Lambeth Palace	74
II.	The Concordat, Canon II	79
III.	The Historical Succession of Conferences on Church Unity	81
IV.	Three Recent Books	82
V.	Concerning the Inter-communion of Believers	84
VI.	Some Words from the Past for Present Uses	86

Preface

IN the year 1908 the Conference of Anglican Bishops, gathered at Lambeth from all quarters of the world, made an overture for conferences among different Christian bodies in behalf of the reunion of the Churches. They made this notable declaration, "We seek not compromise but comprehension, not uniformity but unity." In the year 1920 the Anglican Conference of Bishops, again assembled at Lambeth, sent forth "An appeal to all Christian people." The one idea which they lift above all others is—Fellowship. This call is now laid before all churches. Decisive action must be taken upon it. To let it go by default would be to decide against it.

During this period, between these two conventions of the Anglican Bishops, more rapid and greater approaches towards Church unity have been made than during the four centuries of the history of the divided churches of Protestantism. The great war has brought a divided Christianity to its day of judgment. The promise of another of the days of the Son of man on the earth opens before us.

In these pages the limits of space prevent me from mentioning many approaches from various quarters which are converging towards the same end of world-wide Church fellowship. I must confine myself wholly to an account of the movement with which from its beginning I have been personally conversant; and as I have the materials for a connected narrative of this particular movement throughout this period, I desire now to render them easily accessible to clergymen and the press, for intelligent discussions of these pending issues and for use in various church conferences and study clubs, and for a better understanding of the Lambeth Appeal to them by the people in our congregations. For no great cause comes to

successful issue until it becomes the cause of the people. Martin Luther nailed his theses to the door of the church at Wittenberg; but that did not bring about the Reformation. He held his famous disputation with Eck at Leipsic; but that did not bring about the Reformation. He issued his appeal to the nobles of the German people; neither did that bring about the Reformation. He gave the Bible to the German people in their native tongue; and then nothing could prevent the Reformation.

I

Initial Steps

NOT long after my settlement in New Haven, in 1882, I received from the Rev. Dr. Huntington of Grace Church, New York, an invitation to attend a meeting of a small club of clergymen from several denominations to discuss the subject of Church unity. I attended with interest several of their meetings, but the times seemed unfavorable for the inauguration of any practical proposals.

The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1886 had awakened much discussion, but for the most part it was confined to statements of the positions held by different church bodies, and beyond a general expression of inter-denominational good will, the discussion gradually died away without reaching any practical approaches.

The theological state of mind generally at that time was not ready for the entertainment of the apostles of reconciliation in the schools of divinity, or in the councils of ecclesiastics. Acute doctrinal differences, now quite forgotten, then threatened even worse divisions among the churches. Among the Congregationalists, the Andover controversy and the conflict for a reasonable liberty of scholarship and thought, especially for young men who wished to be sent to foreign missionary service, had not then been fought through; and in other churches likewise a full measure of liberty in the interpretation of creeds and freedom of faith had still to be gained. The new biblical criticism, brought over by students from Germany, was awakening distrust and fears among the older theologians. The heralds of new interpretations of the Scriptures were not at first welcomed in the churches. The richer values to faith of these studies had still to be appreciated. Some who still main-

tained the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures had not gained the simpler faith of a colored candidate for the ministry, who, when asked before an examining Council for his views of the inspiration of the holy Scriptures replied, "I think, Sir, the Scriptures are sufficiently inspired for all practical purposes."

Negotiations, which had been for some time carried on between representatives of the Presbyterian and Episcopal Churches, were broken off until they might be reopened by the acceptance of the Episcopal Church of the doctrine of mutual recognition and reciprocity. At this time, the House of Bishops had manifested such opposition to the consecration of their greatest preacher, Phillips Brooks, as to show that the process of education in his richer and simpler habit of thought must be carried farther before any large realization of the idea of the whole Church of God could be looked for in the world of ecclesiastical confusions.

These conditions were not rendered more favorable by the transference and spread in this country of the Oxford movement and the increasing dominance of the so-called Catholic party within the Episcopal Church.

Those unfavorable conditions in later years gradually disappeared. So again I found myself several years afterwards in the study of Dr. Huntington and we began our conversation where, some twenty years before, we had broken it off. Further association with that eminent, lifelong advocate of the peace of the churches came about in a quite unexpected way. In a volume entitled "Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism," which I had published, I had closed a paragraph with these words, "The Episcopal Church by means of its tradition and its position has, as no other, I am venturing to say, the opportunity and the call to become the mediating church among all the churches. How it shall heed this call, in what definite and practical ways it shall meet this opportunity, seems to be the first and immediate question of a Protestant re-union. Others must wait for its action." The Rev. Dr. Morgan, the rector at that time of Christ Church—the High

church of this city—on reading these words felt, as he afterwards told me, that they required some answer from the Episcopal Church. Accordingly, he wrote to Bishop Brewster of Connecticut offering him the use of his Parish House if he should see fit to invite me to address the clergy of his diocese on the subject of Church unity.

Bishop Brewster wrote at once inviting me to address the clergy at their coming diocesan convention on the subject, "What concessions on either side might reasonably be made in behalf of Church Unity."

I had known Dr. Morgan for many years and our personal relations had always been friendly, but officially and in the public estimation we stood at the opposite poles of the ecclesiastical world, he as the devoted pastor of the High Church Episcopalians, and I as the pastor of the First Church of Christ, established by the Puritan founders of New Haven, and in the line of the Puritan succession. I accepted the cordial invitation of the Bishop and received from the Episcopal Clergy of Connecticut a cordial welcome and thoughtful hearing. Dr. Morgan seemed to me to be as one inspired by a new spirit and beholding as a vision coming down to earth the one Church of God. Shortly afterwards in a letter to me he wrote these striking words, "We must make a bonfire of our prejudices and fan it with the flames of our sacrifices." Afterwards he said to me, "When I consider the problems that are coming in on these shores, we must get together and it is love in the hearts of us all that must bring us together." Not long after that, when we two had thus been brought together where the ecclesiastical difference between us seemed to become a vanishing line, the providence of God took him from the visible to the invisible church above. Suddenly struck down by an automobile, he finished his course with this sacrificial love in his heart.

In 1908 the Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops issued a declaration recommending that conferences should be held with other communions in behalf of Church unity.

At a meeting of the State Conference of Congregational Ministers of Connecticut, not long afterwards, the proposals of that Lambeth Conference were laid before them, and a committee appointed to hold such conferences with Episcopalians. That was the first response, so far as I know, to the overture of the Anglican Bishops. Subsequently, the Congregational Committee held a conference with several Episcopal clergymen, meeting at the invitation of Bishop Brewster at his house in Hartford. From a report of that conference drawn up by the Congregational Committee I take the following extracts: "The single aim of those who took part in this meeting was to consider in the most essential particulars what might possibly be done to form a practical concordat between the Congregational and Episcopal communions by which one of our inherited walls of separation in the visible Church of Christ might be removed." The subject and line of discussion had previously been formulated as follows: "What changes on either side would be necessary in order to realize Christian unity between those who do not, and those who do, belong to the Episcopal Church: 1. With regard to forms of worship? 2. With regard to Church membership? 3. With regard to administrative unity? 4. With regard to autonomy of local Churches? 5. With regard to ordination?"

As a result of this interchange of views, certain methods of approach were suggested as possible, viz.:

1. *Forms of Worship.*—Might not agreement be reached in conformity with the constitution of the Episcopal Church, and with due regard to the diversities of the Churches by the Episcopal recognition in other congregations of such freedom in worship as might be congenial and habitual among them?

2. *Church Membership.*—Might not an orderly unity be attained by further mutual consideration of these facts: (1) that confirmation is not included among matters essential to Church unity in the Lambeth overture; (2) that while in the Episcopal Church confirmation is cherished as the layman's ordination to his share in the priesthood of the whole Church, yet (3) confirmation does not con-

stitute Church membership; and (4) the rubric requiring confirmation according to a general interpretation of it among Episcopalians relates only to their own children and catechumens?

3. *Administrative Unity.*—Might not the office and functions of the Episcopate be adapted to other Christian churches as an organ of their fellowship and a means of executive unity in their common Christian interests?

4. *Autonomy or Self-Government of Individual Churches.*—Might not a working agreement be practical by the recognition on the one hand of the self-governing power of individual churches as local units in their immediate interests and proper jurisdiction, while on the other hand general advisory functions and some degree of Episcopal direction should be secured in matters pertaining to the common work and welfare of the Churches?

5. *Ordination.*—The question concerning valid ordination of the ministry was resolved into the three following inquiries: 1. What further would be deemed necessary to render the existing ministry of other churches regular according to the Episcopal order, and possessed of full authorization to administer the sacraments in Episcopal churches? 2. Might not such desired additional authorization be conferred by the Bishops and received by the ministers of other churches with mutual regard and without essential sacrifices? 3. To secure such regularity and unity in the Christian ministry might not the alternative form of giving authority in the Ordinal of the Episcopal Church be rendered acceptable to all without essential changes by the use of a few prefatory and adaptive words? 4. If this could be done and additional or enlarged authority could thus be conferred upon the ministry of different Christian bodies, might not this be a convincing manifestation of the real spiritual unity of Christ's Church, and a long step be taken towards the attainment of outward, visible unity?

The Conference further received the suggestion that if such concordat could be reached, it might lead to similar understandings with other bodies of Christians, so that in time denominational and church names, which are now felt on all sides to be inadequate or divisive, might lapse into secondary, if not temporary, designations of natural diversities in the one Church of Christ in our country;

and thus the way lead on towards that "Church of the future" which, in the hope of all Christians, shall be as wide as the world.

The Conference was unanimous also in the opinion that the obstacles in the way of such concordat are not insuperable, and that it is now timely and desirable that similar meetings be arranged at different centers between representatives of different Christian Churches for the mutual comparison of views, for concessive rather than controversial discussion, and for the serious consideration of what may possibly be done that we may realize our common and supreme desire to render more visible the oneness or wholeness of Christ's Church.

Among those present at that conference I was rejoiced to see Dr. Huntington. One incident of that meeting I well remember. We had taken up for discussion the form for the ordering of Priests in the Prayerbook. I had remarked that if two letters in the words "Take thou authority to exercise the office of a priest in the Church of God" were altered so as to read, "in this Church," I could see no good reason why a minister of another communion might not receive additional ordination, a good understanding as to the intention on both sides being presupposed. At this Dr. Huntington threw up his hand and exclaimed, "I believe that form of ordination was providentially put into the Prayerbook by the American Bishops for just such a time as this."

As I went out from that conference at midnight and looked up at the stars, it seemed as though the ideal had come very near; but the next morning when I awoke to consider all our constituency on both sides and our inherited divisions—these lesser things of this earth earthy—the heavenly vision of that hour seemed to fade away in the light of common day. But faith for the realization of that vision was made more determined by that first conference.

It was Dr. Huntington who not long afterwards wrote to me these words which well might serve as his epitaph, "We may well be content if we may have any part at the beginning of this century in shaping a cause which is bound to triumph before the century closes." And it was Dr. Huntington who,

the last time I saw him on a wharf as I was leaving him at Northeast Harbor, Mt. Desert, said, "Dr. Smyth, you can do no better service than to devote the remainder of your life to the cause of Church Unity." My thought at that time was most occupied with studies in biology. The two causes were not so far apart as it may have seemed—the new science and the new churchmanship—for we must learn to think biologically if we would think God's thought after Him theologically. Life is a good digester of logical incompatibles.

When at times amid the ecclesiastical confusions and vanities of the hour further efforts may have seemed impracticable, those parting words of Dr. Huntington have come back to me, and he being dead yet speaketh to his own Church as well as to mine.

The National Congregational Council at its meeting in Boston in 1910 adopted unanimously and by a ringing vote a resolution which had been submitted to it similar to the action previously taken by the General Conference of Connecticut in response to the preceding Lambeth Conference of the Anglican Bishops as follows, "We on our part would seek, as much as lieth in us, for the unity and peace of the whole household of faith, and forgetting not that our forefathers, whose orderly ministry we have inherited, were not willingly separatists, we would loyally contribute the precious things, of which as Congregationalists we are the stewards, to the Church of the future; therefore, this Council would put on record its appreciation of the spirit and express its concurrence in the purpose of this expression of the Lambeth Conference, and voice its earnest hope of closer fellowship with the Episcopal Church in work and worship." It was also voted in view of the possibility of fraternal conferences suggested by the Lambeth Conference that a special committee be appointed "to consider any overtures that may come to our body from the Episcopal Church as a result of such conference."

It was a happy coincidence that this Congregational declaration was issued simultaneously with the action of the Gen-

eral Convention of the Episcopal Church, then in session in Cincinnati, calling for a World Conference on Faith and Order as a first step towards unity. As it was received by that body just before their adjournment it was welcomed by them as a seemingly providential response to their new venture of faith. Since that time the commissions of these two bodies have been in continuous correspondence with each other. While appreciating the necessity of patient waiting and careful avoidance of the temptations to indulge in controversial criticisms, I became convinced, however, that the time was at hand when we should no longer be content with throwing off our responsibility for practical proposals of Church unity upon some far-off millennium, satisfied with praying for it as we went to sleep, but that the providence of God in the day of the great tribulations of the world at war was calling us to awake and saying, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: Repent ye, believe in the gospel." And I felt that if we waited, not with irresponsible patience, but with expectant faith, when the moment for some act of unity should be fully come, we should know it. And it came to me, at least, as in a moment of self-revealing certainty,—so much so that I may not hesitate to speak of it as a step determined for me by some Power greater than myself.

II

An Appeal for a Joint Commission of Chaplains in War Times

I WAS on my way to New York to attend a meeting of a sub-committee of the World Conference, perplexed and in mental darkness, as to what might next be attempted, and how all the churches might give their best, their full measure of devotion to the soldiers in camp and at the front. Suddenly the conviction stood out clear and above all else,—we should send out our chaplains to the front in the name and the power of the whole Church of God at home. Each should bear the commission and feel behind him the support of them all. This was the thing to be done; this was the call of the Spirit to the churches of America, and for the Lord Christ's sake it should be done at once. I found a few of us who had met for conference were of much the same state of mind when I made this known to them. We decided that a call to that effect should be issued at once. This accordingly was immediately done. Having received some hundred endorsers of it from the principal communions we sent it forth. The feeling in response seemed to be general that the war called for some decided manifestations of the power of the whole Church to be put forth in some supreme act of unity.

The following sentences from this appeal may be enough to show its purpose. It was addressed "To all our Fellow-Believers." "The crisis of Christianity requires the subordination of all things divisive. Without prejudice to existing personal relations or official fidelities, the whole Church is called to-day to make one sacrificial offering of all things held to be of value in one great venture of faith for God. To-day we should take

counsel not of our fears but of our hopes, as did our fathers before us. To-day our fears may be our disloyalties.

"Bishops, clergymen, laymen—shall we loiter in the way, disputing about many things, when in the suffering of the world our Lord is crucified afresh for the sin of modern civilization? The hour commands unity. By some decisive act our faith in it should be made fact. That might be done if, for example, as a war measure we should put in cantonments, in regiments and on battleships chaplains and ministers, from whatever Church they may come, commissioned not by their own communion only, but by joint ordination or consecration sent forth with whatsoever authority and grace the whole Church of God may confer, bearing no mark upon them but the sign of the Cross. At some single point of vital contact—that or something better than that—the Church might act as one.

"Something must be made visible fact of unity to-day, if the Church—the one Church of the many churches, the only Church which the Lord Himself had faith enough in God to pray for—is to become tomorrow the power of God to save the world. This cannot be too long postponed. These times require quick decisions.

"Therefore we, the undersigned, representing different communions, lay before you this appeal for action, asking for response and for such suggestions as may seem to you timely."

Not long afterwards in response to the appeal we received the following letter from Bishop Tuttle, the Presiding Bishop of the House of Bishops: " . . . I heartily approve of your 'appeal' & shall take pleasure in presenting it to the House of Bishops on April 10.

"Nor do I see anything improper or unwise in your making known my intention to the Bishops or otherwise, or in your publishing in the press whatever you think best about such promise on my part & such proposed presentation on your part."

Accompanying the appeal we sent to the Bishops individu-

ally just previous to their approaching meeting a printed statement of our reasons for making it, and suggesting more specifically what steps might possibly be taken to carry out its intention. From this document I take the following extracts sufficient to explain its purpose and to indicate that at least it required thoughtful and thorough consideration.

"Both a reason for rejoicing and cause for anxious foreboding are put directly before us in this recent remark of an Anglican chaplain: 'The longer I stay at the front, the more I care for Christianity and the less I care for the Church of England.' Shall it indeed come to pass that after the war our returning soldiers and the multitude of the people shall believe more in Christianity and care little or nothing for the Church?

"These two prospects, either of triumph through united action or of tragic loss through divided counsels now lie before the churches; and between these two the decision must be made. At the forefront therefore of our communication to your Episcopate we would put the paramount obligation of the churches to lift up above all, and at the cost of any ecclesiastical sacrifices, the Church of God as the visible embodiment in power of Christianity.

"For this cause, deeming a definite answer urgent, we welcome the opportunity, which the responsive invitation of your Presiding Bishop affords us, of laying before the House of Bishops this appeal to our fellow-believers in all the churches for some act of unity.

"We must ask for our communication your especial consideration because we must recognize the fact which we all alike deplore, that the inherited division between the Episcopal ministry and the ministries of other communions is one chief obstacle to the reunion of the churches of the Protestant Reformation.

"Some single act in itself quite simple may be possible, which may prove to be enough for an immediate unifying point. A slight precipitant will crystallize a whole solution. Unless something done shall be thrown into the discussion of Church unity

it may remain indefinitely in a state of academic indetermination."

We sent to the Secretary of the House of Bishops, at the time of their meeting in New York, a telegram stating our readiness to meet with them, or with any committee whom they might appoint, to consider proposals of such far-reaching importance.

Their meeting, however, was a hurried one, called for a special matter of business, and, as we were subsequently informed, our Appeal and accompanying communications were referred to a committee. Their report was a refusal to consider our proposals. It was submitted just at the close of their session, when some of the Bishops had already left. One of them wrote me that he had time, just as the vote on the adoption of the report was taken, to shout "No!" as he entered the room from another committee meeting. The report, thus hastily adopted, was made by the Chairman of the Committee, Bishop Hall of Vermont. The copy of it afterwards sent to me was dated the day before the session of the House of Bishops. No consideration was given to the reasons for our Appeal and the explanations which we made of it, or of our expression of willingness to receive from them any further overtures for Church unity.

In explanation of the reasons for Bishop Hall's adverse report I may quote these sentences from a letter which he had previously written to me expressing his opinion of our advances as follows:

"Our war commission is providing and equipping chaplains of our own, supplementing the official governmental appointed chaplains, in ministering to our own men in service at home or abroad. This shows the way which we feel bound to take. It [our Appeal] is one of those attempted short-cuts which can only lead to disaster. It would mean Pan-Protestantism with a vengeance and would end all hope of reunion. I could go on endlessly with objections."

A letter which we subsequently received from the Presiding

Bishop relieved us from the temptation to indulge in harsh criticism of this action of the House of Bishops, and I recalled with satisfaction that a few years before it had been permitted me to join with other members of the corporation at Yale University in conferring on Bishop Tuttle the highest honorary degree, that of Doctor of Divinity.

He wrote as follows:

My dear Dr. Smyth:

I am out in the country on Church duty, and here I get your kind letter of the 17th. If I may, may I put in a plea for kindly consideration on your part from the fact that our two days of special session were covered with *agenda* . . . and also of the necessity for us to fill the Missionary Episcopate of the Philippine Islands, Bishop Brent having accepted election to the Diocese of Western New York.

Therefore, the earnest and thoughtful study of your Memorial, such as it thoroughly deserved, was crowded out and opportunity for appointing a conference with you was precluded. You speak of your intention to forward me a communication at a later time. I shall be happy to receive it and to direct its course along any line that you may direct.

Faithfully your brother,

DAVID S. TUTTLE, Presiding Bishop.

The communication from us to which he refers was with regard to the possibility of his selecting a broadly representative, special committee for further conference with our own, but we found that there was no canonical power for the official selection of such a committee.

Bishop Anderson in one of his letters at this time expressed frankly and clearly the difficulties which were to be considered, while at the same time he "was prejudiced in favor of some definite strong movement." "I can assure you," he wrote, "of an open mind." He made some inquiries concerning our Congregational polity, in regard to which, without inquiry,

Bishop Hall in his report had shown lamentable ignorance. I asked Professor Walker to answer Bishop Anderson's friendly inquiries which went straight to the essential matters needing authoritatively to be explained; and no one better than Professor Walker was qualified to do that, not only with the authority of his historical knowledge, but also because of his own recent valuable service in drawing the draft of the Declaration of our Faith and the Constitution of our National Council which was adopted in 1913. I take pleasure in printing his letter in reply in full, as it is valuable for general reference and use among our churches.

New Haven, Conn., 281 Edwards Street,
March 23, 1918.

My dear Bishop Anderson:

Dr. Smyth has shown me your interesting letter of March 12th, and has asked me if I would attempt to interpret, if I can, what we of the Congregational fellowship feel as to the possibility of co-operate action. In your judgment Congregationalism is a system in which individualism is supreme. Of course what is meant by individualism is a matter on which definitions might differ; but I think we Congregationalists do not hold ourselves chargeable with it in the degree which I think you mean.

Congregationalists in America, and increasingly in England, have repudiated the name "Independents." American Congregationalists have always rejected it as inappropriate. They do indeed hold strongly to the autonomy of the local congregation. It can choose its own officers,—but only those of New Testament designation or not inconsistent with New Testament principles. It can admit its own members,—but only on the New Testament terms of the Christion life. It can exercise discipline,—but only in the New Testament way and for offenses which the New Testament, and the Christian spirit which flows from it recognizes. It can express its faith in words of its own choosing,—but only the faith recorded in the New Testament and consonant with New Testament teachings. If it does not do these things then it is disowned,—excommunicated,—by its sister congregations. The result is as considerable a degree of uni-

formity in the various local congregations of the Congregational faith and practise as in any Christian communion of which I am aware.

But local autonomy, under these conditions, is only one side of Congregationalism. American Congregationalism has laid stress, since the beginning on the fellowship of the local congregations, and their mutual responsibility in all matters of common concern. Ordination has always been on the advice, after examination, of a council of churches represented by pastors and delegates, since entrance on the ministry is far more than a matter of local concern. Ordination, save in three or four instances in earliest New England, almost immediately rejected, has always been at the hands of those already themselves ordained. (I may add that, though Congregationalists make little of it, as a matter of historic fact the Congregational ministry is in as direct tactual succession (Presbyterial of course) as that of any communion, its first ministers from which its ordinations trace being presbyters of the Church of England.) The establishment of a new congregation always demands the meeting and approval of a council of churches.

The last half century has seen a very rapid growth of organs for the expression of this fellowship besides those that I have indicated. Each division of a state, usually a county, now sees the local congregations included in it grouped in an association made up of their pastors and delegates. Such an association is responsible for the good standing of its ministers. No minister not so guaranteed can be recognized as a Congregational minister. The affairs of the district are not under its legislative control, but of its supervisory oversight, and what is advised to the local congregations by the association rarely fails of becoming their act. Similarly the churches of a state are represented in a conference, which apportions the proper share of benevolences, superintends outreaching "home-missionary" work, and employs administrative officers. As its highest representative body Congregationalism now has its National Council meeting every other year. The authority of the Council has been rapidly augmenting. It is not a legislative body in the sense that it passes statutes,—canons,—which are mandatory; but it is far more than advisory. It is no body for discussion only, like an English Church Congress. Its session is filled with what I may call advisory legislation; and what the Council decides becomes practically as regulative of the

action of the Congregational body as a whole, as if it were judicial in character. Thus, the Council has twice expressed the faith of the churches in creed-statements which have had very wide acceptance. It has taken full control of the missionary societies through which the outreaching work of the Congregational churches is accomplished. Though under no legal necessity of thus putting themselves under the control of the Council, they one and all did so promptly and cheerfully under the influence of denominational sentiment. The Commission on Unity which Dr. Smyth and I have the honor of representing in part, is a creation of the National Council, and I have no manner of question that the recommendations of this commission, if approved by the Council, would receive the support of the whole Congregational body. In fact I know of no religious communion at the present time that has a more representative body than the Congregational churches, or one that can act more promptly or efficiently. So when you ask whether Congregationalism can "deliver the goods," I can say that I know no religious body that can do it more promptly or effectively.

The Congregational body never, even in its earliest days, has claimed to be the whole church of our Lord. It has always recognized that the one vine had many branches; but it prays and longs, in this time of world-wide stress, for greater unity not merely with its Lord, but with its Christian brethren.

Yours sincerely,

WILLISTON WALKER.

It was gratifying and encouraging at this juncture in our movement to receive this letter assuring us of the sympathy and interest of the women in this venture of faith.

June 25, 1918.

To the Reverend Dr. Newman Smyth,
New Haven, Conn.

Dear Sir:—

A small group of women, communicants of the Protestant Episcopal Church, who are pledged to prayer for the reunion of Christendom, beg to express to you how deeply they have been stirred by

the appeal for an act of unity signed by yourself and others of different communions in January, 1918, by the subsequent communication, which was laid before our House of Bishops on April 10th, and by your statement made after their reply.

We are gratefully aware of the devotion and self-forgetfulness of the writers and the Christian courtesy of their approach, and are led to feel in their action the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Without venturing to express an opinion at this time upon the specific plan proposed, we are devoutly thankful that an effort of this character should be made by leaders of such weight.

We recognize the generous spirit shown in these proposals and we hope that the way may be opened for an equally generous response.

We are confident in the belief that the Divine Wisdom can open a way to the visible unity of God's children, and that He will lead us into it.

(Signed) Alice Van Vechten Brown, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.; Adelaide Teague Case, New York City; Julia C. Drury, Bristol, R. I.; Grace Hutchins, Boston, Mass.; Abby Kirk, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; Charlotte E. Lee, Huntington, L. I.; Euphemia McIntosh, Waltham, Mass.; Emily M. Morgan, Hotel Victoria, Boston, Mass.; Vida D. Scudder, Wellesley, Mass.; Ruth G. Sessions, Northampton, Mass.; Margaret Hilles Shearman, Wilmington, Del.; Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch, New York City; Lucy Watson, Utica, N. Y.

While adhering to our purpose of avoiding any public controversial discussion, pending these negotiations, we deemed it due to our own Congregational body to explain a misapprehension of our faith and polity into which the Bishop's answer had been misled by the report of their Committee on our Appeal, and we could not accept their action as final. Accordingly, we issued another statement in which we explained further our position, and appealed to the whole Episcopal communion. Without entering into the details of this answer, the following extracts from it indicate its purport.

"One of the reasons given not only for declining our proposals, but also any negotiations with us looking towards im-

mediate steps for the unification of our Christian forces, runs as follows: 'We must remind the memorialists that in the case of many of the religious communions represented by them, there is no central and authoritative body with which we can treat as to questions of intercommunion. By the terms of this organization each congregation is independent as to its doctrine, discipline and worship.' While this statement was being adopted by the Bishops, we would respectfully remind them, there were lying on their Secretary's table the following resolutions of the National Council of the Congregational Churches, and also of their Commission on Unity. The National Council at its last meeting in October, 1917, unanimously resolved that 'we do hereby authorize and enjoin the Executive Committee, our several commissions and particularly the Commission on Federation, Comity and Unity, so far as in them lies, to seek the peace of the Churches, and to do whatsoever they may find occasion to do in order that the many Churches of our own country may become one Christian power to overcome the world.' And in order that we personally might be sufficiently accredited to the House of Bishops there was also laid before them a vote of our Commission on Unity authorizing us 'to enter into negotiations with the House of Bishops, or any body representing the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, and to receive in behalf of said Commission any Communication which may be presented.' Our National Council we believe to be a 'central body' representative of our Congregational democracy, which, while exercising no lordship over our churches, possesses such moral authority that our Episcopal brethren, if so disposed, may confidently treat with it on questions of common concern for the advancement of the kingdom of God.

"We are far from insisting upon any proposals we may have suggested as the only or the best possible measures in this hour of emergency. We still hold ourselves in readiness to receive from the Bishops, whether collectively or individually, any overtures for unifying action that shall express the fundamental

unity of Christianity. But we cannot on our part consent to remain in what the Bishops have so truly described as a position of 'comparative powerlessness.' At this critical hour, when as of old all the tribes of our Israel are called to come down against the mighty, our Churches cannot be content to sit like Reuben among their sheepfolds listening to the pipings of their flocks. We must decline therefore to receive the reply of the House of Bishops as an adequate or final declaration of the mind of the Episcopal Church. Rather with increased urgency since the failure of this reply from the House of Bishops to rise to the height of the great argument of God with His Church in this hour of its supreme opportunity, we would lay again our appeal before the individual Bishops and the communions in their respective dioceses, the clergymen of every name in their pulpits, the great body of Christian laity, and the journalists who know what the people are feeling after, as they are becoming more profoundly religious in their sacrificial suffering in the war.

(Signed)

NEWMAN SMYTH,
WILLISTON WALKER."

Here we rested waiting to see what might be the next sign given us as we would press on to know the things that are before, as the Apostle to the common people outside of Jerusalem pressed on, appealing even from Peter, that he might apprehend that for which he was apprehended in Christ Jesus, —not indeed as though we had already attained or any proposals of ours were made perfect.

III

The Next Step

THIS time the sign came to us not in the garb of any ecclesiastical authority; it was a knock at our door by a layman. The Chancellor of the Diocese of New York, Mr. George Zabriskie, wrote to me making the inquiry what the views of the Lord's Supper were as generally held among Congregationalists; were they such as are regarded as permissible within the Episcopal Church? I answered that I had heard the most important words of the Episcopal Office of the Holy Communion repeated in the celebration of the Lord's Supper at the last meeting of the National Congregational Council. After some further correspondence explaining our views, Mr. Zabriskie disclosed to me his intention as follows: "Whether or not any plan comprehending all Christendom be feasible now, there is certainly encouragement in various quarters for such particular or local approaches to unity as circumstances may permit. It is a small matter whether you and I should come to some agreement of minds on this subject, when we consider how large and exalted are the forces that are to be brought together. Nevertheless, I cannot forget that in a particular stage of the World Conference proceedings we found our minds in harmony, and as a result the Garden City Conference saved the situation at the time." Mr. Zabriskie accordingly proposed that he should gather together a few favorably disposed persons with some whom Professor Walker and myself might desire to have meet with them. Shortly afterwards we received from him an invitation to meet for such a conference with a few Episcopalians in New York. Professor Walker and I went, not knowing what might befall us. We came back feeling that it was the Lord's doing, and if we had

the spirit of patient continuance we should be led on and on beyond any foresight or wisdom of our own. We met in one of the rooms of the General Episcopal Theological Seminary at the invitation of its Dean, Professor Fosbrook. We began our conference, not in the library among the books of the theologians, nor with the constitution, canons or polities of our churches before us, but in a quiet room around the table with the book of Common Prayer opened at the Office of the Holy Communion in our hands. Such at least was the birthplace and the spirit among a few men of good will, from which what afterwards was known as the Concordat came forth. At the beginning, as we took our places with Bishop Vincent at the head of the table, we said that we thought conferences might be of little avail unless we came to them with the will for unity. Bishop Vincent at once responded, "That is what we are here for." Then with the will for reunion in our souls and the last Lord's prayer in our hearts, we went over together the whole service of Communion in the Prayer Book, dwelling on every phase and interpretation of it in their usage of it, lingering over those sentences which all would feel to be the very essence and consecration of the sacrament. Not till then did we look up and ask of one another, "What shall we do together?" Before we parted we agreed that Mr. Zabriskie should draw up a draft of such a canon as might enable the Episcopal Church to give to others additional orders in particular instances.

In subsequent meetings our efforts were directed towards such agreements in the phraseology and definitions of the proposed canon as might render it possible for our Episcopal co-workers to secure its adoption by their coming Convention, while at the same time it might be possible for a Congregational clergyman to accept such additional commission of orders without denial of his existing standing as an ordained minister; and in compliance with its conditions in the hope that he might render larger service to the community wherever such common ministry might be advantageous for both communions. In this spirit and effort, with careful regard for each

other's positions, the proposed canon was finally agreed upon to be laid before the coming Episcopal Convention.

As might have been expected its publication occasioned much discussion in the religious papers, and many communications from both sides which seemed to show too hasty interpretation of its requirements. The irreconcilables on both sides threw over back and forth at each other much the same objections. Indeed it seemed to me that if the names were printed in parallel columns they might have been transposed from one side to the other, and the same objections thrown back and forth.

As the time drew near for the meeting of the Episcopal Convention, and the opposition to the proposed canon from the extreme church party seemed to be strong, we deemed it expedient to express in several personal letters our sense of the importance of some positive action. Without that we felt that we could not overcome the prevailing feeling in many quarters that all which was meant by these conferences with us was eventually the absorption and extinction of other communions in the Episcopal Church; and it would be more and more difficult to obtain any support of the World Conference, also, if that impression should not be counteracted. We knew how strongly such an intention had been repudiated by the Episcopal leaders of the World Conference Commission, but frequent utterances from other quarters continued to give that impression. Besides that, we wished ourselves to have it understood that we were not dealing merely with the Episcopal Church here, subject to all the canonical and other limitations of the American Episcopate, but we appealed on the broader basis of the historical Episcopate according to the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral. Furthermore, I had not myself overlooked the article in the Rules of Order of the House of Bishops which reads thus: "The body known as the Bishops in Council, as an assembly of Catholic Bishops, and considering and acting upon matters of duty or responsibility resting on them as a portion of the universal Episcopate may be con-

vened at any time, suitable notice being given by the Presiding Bishop or the Chairman of the House of Bishops." Consequently we were justified on their own conception of their Episcopate in our position that we had to do not merely with the limited body known as the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, subject to its constitution and body of canons; but much more than this, we were seeking reunion with the Reformed Church of England from which our forefathers were driven out, and indeed with the whole Anglican Episcopate. Accordingly, just prior to the meeting of the convention, I wrote to Bishop Brent to this effect, saying that if they refused due consideration of our Appeal, we should immediately be obliged to transfer our endeavors directly to Lambeth, seeking to restore our fellowship with the Church across the sea, which the previous action of the House of Bishops at home with scant consideration of our memorial had denied us.

What happened in the House of Bishops when the proposed Concordat seemed in point of being lost is correctly described in the following newspaper report: "Bishop Charles H. Brent of Western New York saved the day by a dramatic speech." He said: "There is before us a concrete proposal looking to Church unity. It has been carefully thought out in all its details and we believe is capable of being acted upon by this body without transgressing principles of Anglicanism. I am afraid a reference to this matter or talk about the coming Conference of Faith and Order, while we have people appealing to us hungering and thirsting for union, might lead them to think we were sidestepping the great question and afraid to face it fairly. I feel that might be justified. I am loyal to the Anglican Church, but I am disloyal to a deadly conservatism." Then Bishop Brent read a letter from a minister outside the Episcopal Church, who is one of the leaders in the movement, looking towards the Concordat, as follows: "Of course if the Bishops should hold that they have demitted their power to act as Bishops of the catholic or universal Church, and to negotiate with us on the basis of the historic Episcopate, and

that they must wait for an amendment to the constitution of the Episcopal Church, why then the only possible recourse left open to us would be to carry our appeal for unity to the coming Lambeth conference and the Anglican Bishops who are not so limited. I should greatly deplore seeing the American Episcopal Church put into such a position of ecclesiastical powerlessness to meet the present supreme duty of all Christian communions." (This was the position which we had taken in Professor Walker's letter, p. 20.)

The extreme self-called Catholics were well represented in the convention, and the issue seemed doubtful. Our co-workers in this movement, when the vote was finally taken, were much gratified by the result. Bishop Vincent summarized the action of the Convention in this letter:

"My dear Dr. Smyth:

"I think that you will be still more gratified when you hear how much more has been accomplished even up to this date [Oct. 21, 1919]. There was a distinct twofold gain: (1) The devout recognition of what we have done so far; (2) The dignifying the whole movement and proposing to give it official recognition; (3) The appointment of a joint commission, *i.e.*, of both houses, Bishops and Deputies, to continue the conference in order to give wider consideration of some such proposals. The Convention took the necessary first step to an amendment of the Constitution by referring to the succeeding Convention the changes in the Constitution necessary for the adoption of the proposed canon."

Bishop Vincent writes of this proposed amendment: "It does not authorize the individual Bishop to decide cases as the Concordat proposes; but it does do something far larger and better, it asserts the control of the House of Bishops as members of the Universal Episcopate over the presentation or communication of Episcopal orders which it (and not the General Convention) may approve. . . . The locked door—the constitutional difficulty it not yet wholly opened; but the

Bishops have at any rate *put the key into the lock*. I thank God and take courage for the rest to come."

The following extract from a letter which I received from Bishop Anderson, dated October 22, 1919, states concisely and clearly what was accomplished by this favorable action in submitting the constitutional amendment for final adoption by the next Convention: "It authorizes the House of Bishops to act 'in exceptional cases' not provided in the constitution. In other words, I feel grateful to you and others for having brought it about that the Bishops have freedom to act as members of the Universal Episcopate and are not confined solely to the Episcopal Church in the exercise of their ministry. It is not left to the individual Bishop to do as he pleases, but the House of Bishops, by the proposed amendment, would be free to authorize the ordination of men for the exercise of their ministry in other places. This would cover, if the Bishops should so decide, such cases as the proposed Concordat, and it would also cover interchange or ordinations between different Episcopal Churches.

"As I was the author of the Resolutions adopted by the House, and also of the Amendments to the Constitution, I feel that perhaps I have rightly interpreted the action and intention of the Bishops."

The further value of this amendment may be seen as it may better enable the American Episcopate to act jointly with the whole body of the Anglican Church, without needless delay, in any broader proposals for organic fellowship which they eventually may be led to make. Our Congregational Commission may well be grateful that, not forgetting that it was from the Church of England our forefathers came forth, so all along we have held that the restoration of that broken fellowship must be not with the limited constitutional and canonical Episcopal Church of the United States only, but with the Anglican Communion as a whole, and in mutual relations, according to the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, with "a constitutional Episcopate adapted to the varying needs of the nations."

While waiting for the next meeting of the Episcopal General Convention we seized upon what seemed to be a favorable opportunity to define further our own position in this Declaration.

A CALL FOR A COVENANT OF CHURCH UNITY

PUT FORTH ON NOVEMBER 30, 1919, BY THE COMMISSION ON UNITY OF THE NATIONAL CONGREGATIONAL COUNCIL

At this time the leading nations of the world are entering into a covenant of ten years for the realignment of their military forces for the sake of keeping the peace of the world; shall not the churches of Christ do likewise? Shall the diplomats of the world be wiser for this generation than are the leaders of the churches? At this historic hour the people throughout our churches are waiting for some clear call to make common cause of their means and their sacrifices that we may live in a Christian world.

Surely this is no time for tarrying in theological consultations or standing idly within ecclesiastical limitations. Now our spiritual unity needs to be made so visible that the man on the street may see it.

"The way to resume is to resume."

The last National Council of the Congregational Churches, in June, 1921, expressed the belief "that the evangelization of the world rests in a united Church." The Council gave its Commission on Unity ample authorization to confer with other commissions in effecting this unity. A Joint Commssion of the Episcopal and the Congregational Churches has had for some time under favorable consideration a Concordat for common ministry in particular cases; the recent Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops, held in London in 1920, going still further in this direction in an appeal to all Christian people, looked forward to a large organic fellowship in a ministry of the whole Church. These proposals call for responsive action.

As Congregationalists, we can speak only for ourselves. But that nothing may be lacking on our part, we would declare our immediate readiness to confer with representatives of any other churches concerning any realignments or unification of our respective forces

and ministries that may be proposed. In particular, among the desirable objectives for combined action we would be willing to consider means for the attainment of the following ends:

1. The mutual recognition and utilization of the ministry of the different churches for common needs and service in all.

2. The offering thereby of larger fields and greater incentive to enter the ministry to our young men, as well as limiting the number of ministers required for effective service at home, where one may be better than two or more.

3. More gradually, but possibly within the period of this ten years' covenant of peace, such consolidations or combinations of the educational institutions, and their means, of the different churches might be brought about as would prove advantageous for the best education, and fellowship in their studies, of the ministers of the different Churches.

4. And for any philanthropic, social, mission or federated service of the churches.

The governments of this world are co-operating for the common good. Shall the Churches of Christ do less for His Kingdom?

In the second and third points of this declaration attention is called to some possible advantages of greater Church unity which may well be brought to public attention. They deserve constructive consideration from those who are officially interested throughout the churches, laymen as well as professors, in the education of the ministry. Not only do we have among so many denominations an unfortunate multiplication of theological seminaries, sometimes within the same denomination, the lingering benefactions of forgotten controversies; but what is even worse we are not giving thus to all students of divinity the best possible education to meet the demands of these times for thoroughly trained religious and social interpreters of Christianity. I have taken up from the shelves of the Yale Library the catalogues of numerous schools of divinity, and glanced through the books used in their courses of instruction and noticed other advantages rendered accessible to the students; and I have been painfully impressed with the unequal opportunities given to the students for a well-balanced prep-

aration for the ministry, unjust to many who are devoting themselves to the ministry, and also inadequate to give them mutual understanding of the views or tendencies of thought in other seminaries than their own. In short, the churches in their present divided and uneconomic condition are not giving to all the youth preparing for the ministry the best possible education.

IV

The Action of the Episcopal Convention, 1922, on the Concordat

THE Convention did three things. First, it adopted the proposed amendment to the Constitution, which was required in order that the proposed canon might be constitutionally adopted; secondly, it adopted the canon; thirdly, it adopted an amendment to the canon.

The first act was one of much significance for future advance, irrespective of its immediate purpose in opening a way for the adoption of the canon.

The third act was a limitation of the service which the canon was designed to render; and it involves matters for further consideration and conference which were not included in the canon, and not taken up in the consultations of their Commission with the Congregationalists.

The canon, as mutually agreed upon by both the Commissions, among other careful provisions for the ministerial standing and faith of the ministers who should thus be brought into a dual relation and responsibility, contained this clause, "The congregation, if any, in which such minister officiates, shall declare through its proper representative its desire for such ordination on behalf of its minister." The minister would naturally desire to do that; and the consent of his congregation would be mutually desirable, and give promise of good will in the future. But the congregation so sanctioning this new relationship and larger service of its own pastor thereby would do nothing whatsoever to alter its own ecclesiastical relations, or to determine what hereafter they might become. Naturally,

however, such relationship of the Bishop with its pastor would have rendered the Bishop a welcome visitor to his congregation. With this tentative arrangement, promising for further and possibly more comprehensive relationship, a disturbing element was thrown into the agreement by the adoption of this clause, "and shall declare its purpose to receive in future the ministrations and the sacraments of one who shall have been ordained to the priesthood by a bishop." This additional clause had been submitted to us by the previous Episcopal Convention as a recommendation, not as a resolution, and it had been objected to by us as not in accordance with our own approved policy of conserving the faith, not limiting the liberty of our congregations. It was accordingly reported adversely by their Commission in good understanding with us. We might have welcomed it as opening the way to another step forwards, if the Convention had adopted the Concordat as their Commission advised, and then referred for further consultations and conference, any proposals that might seem to them desirable, or about which there may have existed some anxiety in the minds of any. The word, "purpose," used in this additional condition is elastic as a rubber band; it may mean much or little according to the intention of those by whom it is used. But when thrown thus into the carefully drawn language of the canon, it is too much like a monkey-wrench thrown into the machinery.

One alleviating incident, however, in this action of the Convention may not at this point be left unnoticed. The Chairman of their Committee on Canons, the venerable Bishop Hall of Vermont, in his report to the House of Bishops when our proposals were first submitted, had used these words as an additional reason for the rejection of the canon: "The desire for such ordination of its existing minister might very well be due to his personal popularity and not express any conviction on the part of the congregation." That is quite likely, and it is also likely that a popular pastor, so doubly authenticated, might have rendered the relations of his congregation to neigh-

boring Episcopal congregations more hopefully friendly. But the anxious guardian of the book of canons and conservator of the faith once delivered to his own communion, goes still further; he adds, "A congregation over which a bishop had thus exercised some measure of authority for a while might quite conceivably withdraw from any such supervision." I should not myself like to assume that a bishop, who in such acquaintance with a congregation had gained their respect and esteem, could so easily lose his personal touch and friendly influence among them. But a "congregation over which a bishop had exercised some measure of authority for a while"—by what auto-suggestion had Bishop Hall become conscious of such measure of authority over a congregation, I do not know. Certainly I had never heard of it or dreamed of it. If it had been dormant in the inherited sub-consciousness of those with whom we had so many pleasant and frank conferences, they at least were wise enough to let such future perplexities take care of themselves. Fortunately these ominous forebodings were lost from sight in the action of the Bishops, and no intimation of jurisdiction over a Congregational Church occurs in any proposals now under hopeful consideration by all of us. Time and again such intimations of gaining jurisdiction over, or of absorbing other communions in the Episcopal Church, have been repudiated by eminent leaders among them, and disowned in their official promotion of the World Conference on Faith and Order. I have brought this suppressed objection in the report of the Chairman of the Episcopal Committee on Canons to light, only to drop it as something requiring no further consideration. In all our conferences and discussions concerning these never more urgent responsibilities of our common Christianity, we may commend to each other these words of the first teaching-pastor of the First Church of Christ in New Haven, "Let us take counsels of our hopes, and not of our fears."

Extracts from letters concerning the action of the Episcopal Convention on the Concordat.

From the Chancellor of New York, Mr. George Zabriskie.

"It marks the achievement of the movement which you started six years ago, whereby ministers of Protestant churches might receive Episcopal ordination without joining the Protestant Episcopal Church, and so in time a situation could arise in which a larger organic unity might be approached. Such a thing has never happened before, so far as I am aware, in the history of Christendom. I do not know of any other act of any communion by which practical effect has been given to the desire for unity by opening a way through which it might be attained. The barbed wire entanglement of orders had been opened enough to admit of passage through. You will observe that it contains no negative language, nothing which could preclude a congregation from receiving other ministrations. It is intended to provide that in some small degree the congregation shall stand by its minister when ordained under the provisions of the canon. It is the mildest way in which the Convention could express the hope that a congregation which had once had the ministrations of a person who had been ordained under the canon would be so well satisfied that they would always receive them. If the minister has no congregation, this clause would be inoperative."

Mr. Zabriskie's legal mind qualifies him to interpret the sense in which the somewhat indefinite clause is used in this connection.

I have also received the following valuable estimate of the action of the Convention from Bishop Vincent of Southern Ohio who was the Chairman of the Committee on the Canon.

Cincinnati, Ohio, February 27, 1923.

My dear Dr. Smyth:

With reference to the action of our last General Convention on the so-called "Concordat":

Practically, the Canon as adopted has less value now, of course,

than it might have had at one time as a war measure. But it may still eventually serve its general purpose of promoting "intercommunion in particular instances," not only of missionaries and of Army and Navy Chaplains, but also of other ministers who believe that the acceptability or effectiveness of their ministry may be enhanced by the possession of episcopal Orders and in communicant relations with the Episcopal Church. This value will depend largely, of course, on what further action our Church may take in 1925, in providing for the adaptation of our Ordination Service to such "special cases." The amendment of Section I of the Canon, providing for a pledge by the applicant minister's congregation always to receive the ministrations of one episcopally ordained, may be open to a favorable construction, or it may be eventually modified.

But the greatest value and largest significance of the Canon are in the fact that it was actually adopted at last by both Houses of our General Convention, and by such large majorities. For this fact was not only evidence in general of the growth of a larger and more liberal spirit in the Episcopal Church toward other Churches; it was also proof of our continued "will to Unity," temporarily called in question by the hasty action of our House of Bishops on the Memorial presented to it in 1918. More than that; it was also the expression of the Convention's determination to "do something practical" in the interest of Unity, even though the Canon was recognized as being not at all a comprehensive scheme for that but only "a step toward it."

Of even greater value and larger significance was the Convention's amendment of its Constitution, establishing as a principle our possible ordination hereafter of men to minister in other Churches than our own. It was this which made possible at all any favorable action on the Canon. It also had regard to the increasing likelihood of our being asked occasionally to ordain priests for the Eastern Orthodox Churches in this country. But the best of this constitutional amendment is that it does open the way now for possible action by our American Episcopal Church on the lines of the Lambeth Appeal, in sharing our episcopal orders with those who desire them in the interest of world-wide Unity.

For that was the really great spirit in which that Appeal was made:—not as an ultimatum, but as at least one practical proposal;

not in the selfish interest of any one Church or Communion, but in the unselfish interest of the Church Universal; not as concerned merely with the union of particular Churches, but chiefly with the reunion of all Christendom; not as reflecting on the efficacy of any ministry but as desiring to secure "a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church . . . opening the way to wider service in a reunited Church." And there was no step proposed to others in the interest of such a universally recognized ministry, which we are not willing to take ourselves.

Cordially yours,

BOYD VINCENT.

V

The Lambeth Appeal

THE following Appeal to all Christian People has been issued by the Archbishops and Bishops of the Anglican Communion, assembled in Conference at Lambeth Palace. An official copy was sent to me.

AN APPEAL TO ALL CHRISTIAN PEOPLE

FROM THE BISHOPS ASSEMBLED IN THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1920

We, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, in Conference assembled, realizing the responsibility which rests upon us at this time, and sensible of the sympathy and the prayers of many, both within and without our own Communion, make this appeal to all Christian people.

We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body. We believe that the Holy Spirit has called us in a very solemn and special manner to associate ourselves in penitence and prayer with all those who deplore the divisions of Christian people, and are inspired by the vision and hope of a visible unity of the whole Church.

I. We believe that God wills fellowship. By God's own act this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in His Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible, and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church.

II. This united fellowship is not visible in the world to-day. On the one hand there are other ancient episcopal Communions in East and West, to whom ours is bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. On the other hand there are the great non-episcopal Communions, standing for rich elements of truth, liberty and life which might otherwise have been obscured or neglected. With them we are closely linked by many affinities, racial, historical and spiritual. We cherish the earnest hope that all these Communions, and our own, may be led by the Spirit into the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. But in fact we are all organized in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship, and tending to live its own life apart from the rest.

III. The causes of division lie deep in the past, and are by no means simple or wholly blameworthy. Yet none can doubt that self-will, ambition, and lack of charity among Christians have been principal factors in the mingled process, and that these, together with blindness to the sin of disunion, are still mainly responsible for the breaches of Christendom. We acknowledge this condition of broken fellowship to be contrary to God's will, and we desire frankly to confess our share in the guilt of thus crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of His Spirit.

IV. The times call us to a new outlook and new measures. The Faith cannot be adequately apprehended and the battle of the Kingdom cannot be worthily fought while the body is divided, and is thus unable to grow up into the fulness of the life of Christ. The time has come, we believe, for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church. The removal of the barriers which have arisen between them will only be brought about by a new comradeship of those whose faces are definitely set this way.

The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all "who profess and call themselves Christians," within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian

Communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled.

V. This means an adventure of good will and still more of faith, for nothing less is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God. To this adventure we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church.

VI. We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:

The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief;

The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ;

A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.

VII. May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry? It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communions which do not possess the Episcopate. On the contrary, we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. But we submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim which we make on behalf of the Episcopate. Moreover, we would urge that it is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church. But we greatly desire that the office of a Bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian Family in the title of Father-in-God. Nay more, we eagerly looked forward to the day when through its acceptance in a united Church we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body in the

apostolic rite of the laying-on of hands, and in the joy and fellowship of a Eucharist in which as one Family we may together, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the one Lord our worship and service.

VIII. We believe that for all, the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences. To this end, we who send forth this appeal would say that if the authorities of other Communions should so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, Bishops and clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. It is not in our power to know how far this suggestion may be acceptable to those to whom we offer it. We can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministries of grace, theirs and ours, shall be available for the service of our Lord in a united Church.

It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship.

In so acting no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry. God forbid that any man should repudiate a past experience rich in spiritual blessings for himself and others. Nor would any of us be dishonouring the Holy Spirit of God, Whose call led us all to our several ministries, and Whose power enabled us to perform them. We shall be publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call to wider service in a reunited Church, and imploring for ourselves God's grace and strength to fulfil the same.

IX. The spiritual leadership of the Catholic Church in days to come, for which the world is manifestly waiting, depends upon the readiness with which each group is prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of a common fellowship, a common ministry, and a common service to the world.

We place this ideal first and foremost before ourselves and our own people. We call upon them to make the effort to meet the demands of a new age with a new outlook. To all other Christian people whom our words may reach we make the same appeal. We

do not ask that any one Communion should consent to be absorbed in another. We do ask that all should unite in a new and great endeavour to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which He prayed.

The Lambeth Conference of Bishops represents the whole Anglican Communion throughout the world. It has no authority to legislate, but its deliberations and conclusions represent the mind of the Church and are received as indicative of its policy with regard to all the questions that are submitted to it. The American Episcopate was well represented at its recent meeting.

Two hundred and fifty Bishops from every continent and from the isles of the sea were assembled in Lambeth Palace on July 4, 1920. "On that day were read in every Anglican Church these words from the Gospel for the day, 'Launch out into the deep.' They did launch out into the deep, it has been said, of unknown possibilities, but for that 'new adventure of faith' there had been much previous preparation and careful plans laid."

The question of reunion of the churches was submitted to a large committee of seventy-two members for careful consideration and report. A whole week was spent by the committee in patient and serious discussions, which, we are told, ended in what seemed to be an impossible *impasse*. But, as one of the Bishops afterwards said, "They were being prepared for the revelation of the Spirit." From their deliberations came the suggestion of an "Appeal to all Christian People." On Friday, August 4, the fourth week of their session, came the memorable day when the report of the Committee was submitted and the vote was taken upon it. From the accounts given of it by those present, the following sentences may suffice. The Archbishop of York moved the adoption of the report. One after another described the workings of the Spirit upon his mind. "He is working," said one, "in us and through us, but chiefly beyond us." "I have been unwilling," said another, "to give up the

crystallized opinions of my early life. I have struggled against prejudice, but now I yield." "We are passing," said another, "through something unprecedented. There is a real sacrifice and it is right." The Archbishop of Canterbury in closing said: "The hour is a solemn one, indeed, in after years to look back upon. We old men are handing on our trust to be developed by those whose splendid adventures have taught them new lessons. They will garner what these tremendous years have taught. We set our hands to a venture of faith, believing that God is with us and calling us." The Appeal was carried with only five dissenting votes. "When the deciding vote was taken I wonder whether there was a bishop present with eyes dry. As the Primate asked us to stand in silence and thank God, we all felt that we had not only been guided but ruled by the Holy Spirit." Of the five dissenting votes that were given one of them, says the English writer from whom I am taking this account, was the revered Bishop Hall of Vermont, who has publicly stated that he not only expressed strong disapproval from the Catholic point of view, but ended by voting against the whole scheme.*

The Anglican Bishops assembled at Lambeth had no authority to make canons, but what is as effective as any canon, they adopted the following resolutions in addition to their Appeal:

"The Bishops of the Anglican Church will not question the action of any Bishop who in the years between the initiation and the completion of a definite scheme of union, shall countenance the irregularity by admitting to communion the baptized but unconfirmed communicants of the non-Episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme.

"A Bishop is justified in giving canonical authorization to ministers, not Episcopally ordained, who in his judgment are working towards an ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal, to preach in churches within his Diocese, and to clergy-

* The above extracts are taken from an article by Eugene Stock, D.C.I., entitled "Lambeth—and Afterwards," in the *Constructive Review*, 1921, pp. 162 ff.

men of the Diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers."

This notable resolution, allowing to this extent an interchange of pulpits between Anglicans and Free Churchmen, goes beyond the canon which some years ago Dr. Huntington urged upon the Episcopal Convention, allowing ministers from other churches to preach occasionally in Episcopal pulpits, but in which as finally adopted the words "to make addresses" were substituted for the word "preach."

There is no one among the English Bishops whose opinions are more highly to be esteemed than Bishop Talbot of Winchester. I regard it as one of the privileges of my life that when I was in England as one of a delegation in behalf of the World Conference on Faith and Order, I was enabled to meet him and to talk freely over these great subjects, and since then to have some interesting correspondence with him. His whole account as given in an article in the *Contemporary Review* is well worth reading. I must take only these abbreviated sentences: "The topic of Church Reunion," he writes, "was one felt with an intensity which was new and in itself symptomatic, to us of transcendent interest. How was it that the result was so different from what might have been expected and that 'the iron gates seemed to open to us of their own accord'? There was the power of a great idea or truth. We had been stooping over our work and our difficulties, questioning how best we might 'cobble together' some of the innumerable fragments of Christendom. We felt a sudden and common constraint to lift up our eyes to the high ideal—to realize that it was the essence of the ideal to take shape in fact, and that this was the purpose of Christ himself. The Vision, we were led to say, is that of a Church genuinely Catholic, loyal to all truth, and gathering into its fellowship all who profess and call themselves Christians. We took shame on that account, and acknowledged ungrudgingly, for our Communion, our full share of it. An idea, dormant today, becomes tomorrow an explosive force, or a pervading influence. . . . Why did this

idea, this truth, of the Great Church come home to us as it did, and even in our poor expression of it seem to awake so much response in others? Partly, I think, because of the readiness born of a great desire. . . . The craving was for something large enough to kindle the imagination, and to give satisfaction to the reason and the affections. . . . I wish to say a grateful word for much that has passed, thank God, in the last decade. It may be well for a senior man to witness to the marvellous change for the better in the last ten years in interdenominational relations." Then in a paragraph concerning some reconsideration of language and thought by High Churchmen he says: "It was common to think of the Church as confined to those Churches which retained the Apostolic Ministry, as well as the Creeds and the sacraments, to think of others as in schism. All this is gone, and gone with it much of the temptation to arrogance and self-assertion whether Anglican or Catholic. The work of the spirit in other communions is the evident sign that they are within the great fellowship."

I have received the following letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury in reply to a letter of mine.

My dear Dr. Smyth:

I am very glad to receive your letter and to know of the cordial welcome which the Lambeth Appeal has received from your own hands. I quite understand the difficulty with regard to pressing the Appeal for formal discussion in America before the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church had expressed its mind upon it. Now as you say the road is clear and with the General Convention endorsing the Appeal we may hope that other Christian Churches in America will have it put before them and be able to form a judgment and give it expression.

I am very glad to hear that you propose to issue a supplementary pamphlet following on your recent "Approaches towards Unity," and I am quite certain that the inclusion of the Lambeth Appeal therein will have a quite special value in rousing interest of a practical kind amongst the Christian Churches of America.

You ask me whether I can give you any words or documents which

might elucidate the Appeal and might therefore be published in your pamphlet. I do not think that I can do better than send you a copy of the very striking Report of a Joint Conference held at Lambeth published under the title "Church Unity." It is the result of very careful and deliberate discussions on the Appeal, and more discussions are now being held and will, I hope, issue in a further report. I also enclose a copy of the Address which I had the privilege of delivering to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland last year. Amongst books of value and interest on the Appeal, Malcolm Spencer's "Impasse or Opportunity" published last year by the Student Christian Movement has a high place, and there are many articles which deserve careful attention in the "Constructive Quarterly" both from the episcopal and the non-episcopal point of view. I ought to add that Mr. Malcolm Spencer is the Secretary of the Free Church Fellowship in this country and himself a Free Churchman. I think you will be interested also in "Lambeth and Reunion—An interpretation of the mind of the Lambeth Conference of 1920" by the Bishops of Peterborough, Zanzibar and Hereford. It was published within a few months of the Conference by Bishops who took prominent part in the issuing of the Appeal. Of course it has no authority except such as those individual Bishops give it and I must not be understood as necessarily agreeing with all their views or interpretations.

I noted with considerable interest the publication in the *Churchman* last year of "A Call for a Covenant of Church Unity" issued by the Congregational Commission on Unity and bearing your signature together with that of Dr. Boynton and Professor Walker. I suppose that was in the nature of an interim utterance. If, however, your Commission has issued any Report or further document it would interest me to see it. I understand from your letter that it will be for the Commission on Unity to report to the National Council next October.

I was also interested in reading the account of the General Convention of the Episcopal Church to see that they had approved of the new Canon on the Concordat. I have not, naturally, had much opportunity of hearing how the Canon has been received, though it it a matter which again interests me greatly.

It was a pleasure to hear from you again and to be reminded of

talks at Lambeth in connection with the World Conference on Faith and Order. Perhaps we may have the happiness of seeing you over in England again one day.

Having thus received from the Church of England a "message from the heart," which Leibnitz found to be the first thing needful, we may now turn hopefully to his method of proceeding "as accountants and surveyors might";—to the practical undertaking of adjusting to each other the ecclesiastical polities and making the most of the values of too long wastefully separated communion. This further task at the present time is being carefully worked out by two large and representative committees in England, one composed of the two Archbishops and other bishops and representatives of the Church of England, and the other of well-known representatives of Non-Episcopal Communions appointed by the Federal Council of the Free Churches. They have recently issued a preliminary report which is of such value that it is here printed in full. (See Appendix.)

This report has great value not only because of the eminent leaders whose signatures are attached to it, but also as indicating a right method for reaching the solution of the problems that must be settled in the practical reunion of the churches. Nothing is more evident to the historian who studies the causes of the continued divisions of the churches than the failure to put the first values first and other things in their relative order of importance. If all should sincerely determine to do this, to begin with the most precious things of our common Christian heritage and faith, and then go down the scale of things of lesser or temporary values, not indeed compromising but comprehending lesser differences in these higher unities, giving up what needs to be given up in order that we may give ourselves wholly to one another for Christ's sake—this would lead us on straight and far towards that fellowship of all believers in work and worship. It is vain to meet and pray for it, and then to stand idly by until the Lord Himself shall come—sometime!

Observe particularly in this report that the order in which the offices and functions of the ministry are taken up is clearly and admirably set forth. To follow this order in our conferences and discussions might tend both to clarity and charity.

VI

The Psychological Factor in the Movement towards the Reunion of the Protestant Churches

NO serious difficulties in the way of Church unity are to be found in the existing varieties of religious experience, or in the differences of forms of worship to be adapted to the needs or habits of individuals. The psychological factor, however, goes down deeper into human nature than such differences. It has been a disruptive force in the history of the church. Pent up too long it has broken forth through the existing crust of conformity, causing abrupt chasms, which afterwards have hardened into permanent, confronting walls of separation. These inherited schisms and their causes must be fully recognized; we must either surmount them or find the way around them to some broad comprehension, if the Church of God is to recover its lost unity.

One primal cause of these confronting divisions should be clearly recognized and allowed in practical proposals for reunions; that is, the personal psychological factor. Indeed indications of this more fundamental cause of reformations or schisms may be discerned in the minor personal characteristics of founders and leaders of existing denominations and sects, or even at this time of conflicting parties, threatening heresy trials and divisions within the same communion. Notice, for example, Martin Luther's personal psychology, as disclosed in his letters to his children, his practical sermons to working people, and in the incident related of him by a casual spectator that he carried a bunch of flowers in his hand in his disputation with Eck at Leipsic.

How different was the mould in which nature had cast the psychology of John Calvin. I do not know how he played with little children. He dwelt on the shore of the beautiful lake of Geneva. He might have looked out from his study window and beheld the mountains with the glory of the dawn upon their summits. He might have dropped his laborious writings, and wandered along the shores of the lake in their beauty and blossoming, as Jonathan Edwards found communion with God as he walked among the trees along the banks of the Hudson. I wonder if John Calvin ever did. I have not chanced in his writings (so far as I have read them) upon any such allusions to nature. Or, to recall one other instance among many, how different was the personal psychological factor in Erasmus, with his Oxford learning and his native wit, which fitted him to write that effective prelude to the Protestant Reformation, the Praise of Folly, although it unfitted him to become himself the champion of the Reformation. He could content himself with watching the progress of the conflict of the Reformation, leaving for us this excellent admonition that there are some questions that cannot be settled by the next General Council, but must wait for the last day, and that will be time enough.

So other examples might be cited from the biographies of those who are held in esteem by their followers as their forefathers and the founders of their several churches. Such psychological diversities are recognized in these words of the Lambeth Conference, of 1908, which might well serve as a motto for the cause of reunion, "Not compromise but comprehension, not uniformity but unity."

In an article giving an account of the recent Lambeth Conference, The Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Talbot, I find this recognition of one of the chief obstacles to reunion, occasioned by a radically divisive psychological difference.*

"A good understanding of what we may allow for differences of intention in doing the same thing together, or in the use of

* In *Contemporary Review*, October, 1920.

creeds, is quite indispensable in inter-church conferences. What latitude for differences of intention in the use of the same words of a confession of faith or in doing the same things in acts of consecration or worship must be recognized and their free play provided for in the company of Christian believers? Failure to recognize just these differences of intention in doing the same thing or repeating the same words which result from diversities of personal psychologies has been a fruitful cause of splitting up the communion of the saints into sects."

In the preparation of the proposed canon the question of intention in the additional ordination and ministry of the sacraments was one of the first things carefully considered. The Chancellor of the Diocese of New York defined our ecclesiastical use of intention as follows: "Upon this point there ought to be no room for doubt. The sense of intention in which such orders are conferred or accepted is the sense or intention in which they are held in the Universal Church. Neither the bishop conferring such orders nor the minister receiving them should be understood to impugn the efficacy of the minister's previous ministry."

"The same principle applies to the ministration of the sacraments. The minister acts not merely as the representative of the particular congregation then present, but in the larger sense he represents the Church Universal, and his intention and meaning should be our Lord's intention and meaning as delivered to and held by the Catholic Church."

The same truly Catholic principle that the intention of the Church in ministering the sacrament is not to be limited by any private interpretation, applies to ordination. First, it puts ordination in its proper place, as not constitutive of the sacrament of the Eucharist, but in its secondary value as the means for the assurance of a right administration of the sacrament.* Secondly, it does not require that the person who is to be

* What the doctrine in this respect of the Roman Church is was explicitly defined in this sentence from the Bull of Leo XIII rejecting Anglican Orders. "When one has rightly and seriously made use of the due matter and form

ordained to the priesthood must necessarily be of the same mind or intention as the official who ordains him. That is, a difference of intention would not render the ordination void, provided the ordination itself be given in matter and form as the Church requires. Within the Episcopal Church wide differences of views are held of the intention of Ordination, as they are in other communions.

The Lambeth declaration is perfectly clear and conclusive on this point. It does not deny the "efficacy" of the sacraments of other communions. The use of that single word *"efficient"* is enough to relieve divisive questions concerning the validity of the orders of other ministers.

When the Anglican Bishops have thus let down the bars to fellowship in a common ministry, it would be worse than folly for Congregational ministers, or Episcopal clerics, to put them up again in order that they may continue to bar each other out from inter-communion. This, however, is not to say that in order to secure regularity in the exercise of this liberty, suitable forms and precautions might not properly and without controversy be arranged.

One Church, accordingly, might properly ask a minister who had been previously ordained in another communion, to receive additional orders from it, if desirous to serve in its congregation, for the sake of maintaining the regularity of their own customs, or the full assurance of all of their communicants. Although one might feel that to be unnecessary, it would not be an act of accommodation or Christian good will to refuse such added authorization.

requisite for the offering or conferring of a sacrament, he is considered by the fact itself to do what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine which holds that to be a true sacrament which is conferred according to the Catholic rite, even by the ministry of a heretic or an unbaptized person."

This unequivocal papal statement both of the principle and the doctrine of the Catholic Church cannot be evaded by assuming that it must refer only to baptism.

It states a general principle of sacramental efficacy, inherent in and derivative from, the sacrament itself when rightly administered in matter and form. There is no allusion to the particular sacrament of baptism.

A further question, however, has been raised as to how far difference of intention should be allowed between a Bishop who ordains and the person whom he is to ordain. To a large extent this must be left as a personal equation. The general principle would be, as already stated, that the intention of the whole Church should be the common intention, not differences of personal conception, of what the act of ordaining may mean. It might be equally intolerant for a non-Episcopal body to insist that a person receiving ordination to its ministry must agree with its view of the office of the ministry, as it would be for an Episcopal Bishop to insist on anything more than the common intention of the whole Church. Narrowness of view and action in this respect may by no means be confined to one side.

Without dwelling needlessly on these really subordinate ecclesiastical matters of concern, the whole hitherto divisive problem concerning ordination seems to me to be reduced to Christian simplicity when put in this way; suppose one of us were invited to preach in an Episcopal pulpit, as one of us occasionally has been, and just as he was about to ascend into the pulpit the good Bishop should graciously meet him and, laying his hand on him, should say, "By whatever authority or grace of God as a Bishop may have been given me, take thou authority from me as a priest in this Church"; and then should add his prayer of consecration and blessing for him;—would he not, going up into that pulpit with a sense of added grace and presence of the Spirit, feel inspired to preach as perhaps never so well before with that prayer and consecration abiding in his heart? And he might return carrying with him to his own people an added faith and spiritual benediction.

So may our inherited, outgrown, but too persistent, habits and prejudices fall away from us when we reduce them to the last terms of simplicity and love.

In discussions of ordination questions we often start from the wrong end of the question. We begin by bringing forward our chief objections. Let us try the other way and begin by

bringing out our best intentions. The Episcopalian may start from the assertion that historically the Bishop has authority to ordain the clergy. The non-Episcopalian will stand fast on the assertion that his Church has its authority to consecrate its own ministry. The one might compare his view of the unbroken succession of the ministry to a telegraph wire, supported by an unbroken succession of poles, running far back to the original power house of Apostolic authority. The other, while not perhaps intimating that the wire at some points might have been grounded—some supports having fallen—will confidently affirm that he gets his power straight from above—a wireless transmission. It may not occur to them whether both may not be right, and whether each method, the Apostolic succession and the Spiritual transmission, may not each be true and complementary to one another. Usually after such controversial meetings they return each to his own "impregnable position." They end where they began. Let us begin then at the other end of the difficulty, and see how we may come out. We may start by inquiring, each of himself, what is our intention either in bestowing or receiving ordination? Here we may start at least at the beginning of the first Scriptural mile to walk together. Suppose then that the Bishop signifies what he deems to be the intention of his Church in conferring orders. Let the other, seeking to understand, try to state what is the intention of his Church in its way of setting one apart for the Christian ministry. Only a step or two farther they may have thus gone on this first mile; but they have taken it together. They find after a while that they are not so far apart after all as to the general intention of holy orders. The way begins to open before them, and the prospect becomes interesting, but the end not in sight. Then they come to a turn in the way where they may find it difficult to keep pace with each other. The signs by the roadside are not quite clear. One hesitates, but the other will press on. They have gone the first mile keeping sight of one another. And then, being led by an irresistible feeling in their hearts that, having gone so far together, they cannot separate, they

enter the second mile. And as they walk on, even like the two disciples on the way from Emmaus towards the Holy City, their hearts burn within them, as though an unknown Companion were leading them towards the place where the other disciples were gathered together, and they could tell how the presence of the risen Lord had been made known to them in the breaking of bread.

This is no fanciful sketch. Something like this has been the experience of some of us who have been meeting each other in these conferences for several years past, and have been coming more deeply and truly to know each other. We at least may not lose the sense of some higher companionship of the Spirit, nor ever again doubt to what end the way must lead.

Our difficulty in accepting the proffer of additional Episcopal ordination, although made in honorable terms, springs rather from a general attitude of mind than from discussions of particular proposals. To receive further ordination may seem humiliating in our own feeling at least. Very likely; but is that only on one side? We say, we do not require anything from others when we extend to them the right hand of our fellowship with prayer and renewed consecration. Are we so sure of that? Let one of them answer—a missionary Bishop, even the Bishop of Zanzibar, whose objection to inter-communion of missionary converts a few years ago caused the Kikuyo controversy to break out. He also went to Lambeth, and he came away with the vision of the whole Church. With two other Bishops he has written a book called "Lambeth and Reunion" and this is what he would bear witness of:

It may be said that this is asking more from Nonconformists than from Anglicans. We would venture to ask whether this is a case where nice calculations can be made of the sacrifice involved, and a balance struck as between this group and that. Assuming that it is so, that more is asked of one group than of another, we know where the pre-eminence lies in the scale of Christian values. Even in the war the only true pre-eminence was one of sacrifice and service.

It is so here. For we cannot shut out the thought of Him who declined the immeasurable right that was His, and refused to regard His position as "a prize to be grasped at," but "for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven." Nor can we forget that He, in the days of His flesh, was pleased to submit to a consecration and mission at His baptism which by no sort of right could have been demanded of Him. If He, the head of the body, did not disdain that humiliation shall the members complain if a similar call comes to them? Thus, perchance, in this twentieth century, it becometh us to fulfil all rightousness.

It calls upon all ministers to pass a self-denying ordinance whereby they would be ready to accept a new commission from the larger family and for the larger service. We do not deny that this raises grave difficulties at once. For the natural man in the Anglican will not easily submit himself to Roman ordination, any more than the natural man in the Nonconformist will desire to submit himself to the hands of the bishop. Such a step seems to cast an inevitable reflection on past status, and to ask more than a minister of God can reasonably be expected to give. Yet we cannot think that the difficulty is insuperable. On the contrary, we believe that in view of the immensity of the Church's task and of the urgent necessity for reunion, men will not be wanting in every Church who for the joy that is set before them will be willing thus to go all lengths in the cause of future fellowship. We note at once that there is no question of repudiating our ministries. "No one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry." We make no estimate and pronounce no verdict upon each other's orders. We are content with the only estimate which really counts, namely, that of a "past experience rich in spiritual blessings for himself and others." We make a mutual surrender for Christ's sake to meet doubts or difficulties in any other group which is part of Christ's body.

It is their desire, real, sincere, and passionate, to cause the sins of their predecessors to be forgiven by the non-episcopal communions, and to win for the Anglican bishops a heartfelt welcome within the new groups.

The bishops feel that these groups, while not themselves guiltless, have very great cause to throw much of the blame for disunion on former Anglican bishops, as on Anglican laymen in high office in the

State. They remember with shame the revengeful ejections of 1662, and the cruel legislation of that period which made the legal position of Nonconformists almost intolerable. They are conscious to the full of the many graces and blessings showered by God upon the non-episcopal communions, and they recognise the many "inheritances of grace" laid up by them during their years of existence; inheritances which Anglicans can, in logic, make no claim to share. But the bishops desire intensely to be welcomed to a share in these good things. They desire to be received gladly by the children of the non-episcopal prophets into the family-life their sufferings helped to establish. Accused as they may be, with some justice, of building the tombs of these prophets, in these latter days they would in God's sight claim recognition of their spiritual kinship with the prophets. It is, therefore, with a quite genuine sense of guilt in respect of the Anglican communion's share in disunion, and with an entirely sincere plea for a hearty welcome into the new groups within the fellowship, that they ask for official recognition.

This at least may be said. It deals with the *whole* situation. It provides a scheme by which union may be effected with the Church of Rome no less than with the youngest communion of the Reformed Churches. It provides a way by which the gifts and experiences of the various Churches, so far from being slurred over or scrapped, are to be conserved for the whole Fellowship, and thereby immeasurably increased both in intrinsic value and scope of action. It recognises that this organic Fellowship must have a common ministry recognised throughout the whole body, and it suggests in effect that all existing ministries must make their contribution to the new order; the non-episcopal churches bringing their gifts of inspiration and prophecy, and the episcopal Churches their treasures of history and order and devotion. The idea of "submission" on either side is completely excluded. Rather we call our brethren to a new and inspiring co-operation in reclaiming for the ministry, both theirs and ours, that fulness of life and action which was characteristic of the primitive undivided Church. This can only be when the separated streams of spiritual life have met once more in what will indeed be a "river of God."

To come to a practical example, we three bishops who write this book would earnestly desire, when the time comes, to receive what-

ever ministerial commission the Wesleyans or the Presbyterians or the Romans might desire to give us. It is not that we doubt for one instant our own ordination in the Church of God, but that we desire by an outward and visible act to confess our share of responsibility for the schism which has made such a procedure necessary, and to receive in solemn symbol those streams of spiritual endowment from which, partly by our own fault, we have been alienated. We desire to go all lengths to recover a ministry which is not denominational but truly Catholic; a ministry, that is, linked to the Apostles in the past, recognised by the whole Christian people in the present, bearing the commission of the whole Church, and bringing to the service of the world the very fulness of ministerial power. There is no room for prelacy here.

VII

Three Practical Proposals

THE Lambeth Appeal acknowledges the efficacy of the sacraments of other communions. This involves an admission of the dependent question concerning the validity of non-episcopal ordination. Hence it becomes possible to confer concerning these three practical proposals.

First. The intercommunion of believers. Under what regulative agreements shall this be secured, so that the communion shall be rightly administered in matter and form, and to persons prepared to receive it?

Second. The fellowship of the ministry. What form of commission of authority by any one church may be desired in order that the ministry of another church may be duly authenticated to minister in its services?

Third. Questions of jurisdiction or administration. The Anglican Church holds that the Episcopate may be generally recognized for these purposes both on account of its historical continuity, and its prevalence among by far the greater number of believers in all lands.

The last question would require readjustments in accordance with the differences in administrative jurisdiction of various communions. For Congregationalists the matters involved would be simpler, and in some ways more easily worked out than for others. For the remark that Dr. Huntington of Grace Church, New York, once made to me has much truth in it, that the fundamental difference between the Episcopal Church and the Congregational is that in the former the unit of administration is the diocese, while in the latter it is the individual congregation. For the Congregationalist, accordingly, the crux of such proposals would be to secure a sufficient

regard for self-government of the local church with necessary co-operation, and the control of common interests by the churches all together represented in their National Council, or also locally in their State conferences. How may the historic Episcopate be adapted to various needs?

In an address made by Rev. Dr. C. B. Wilmer to four clubs in Atlanta, Georgia, he corrected the common misunderstanding that the phrase "Historic Episcopate" as used in the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, means that the validity of the ministry depends on a tactual line of succession from the Apostles. He rightly says, "That is exactly what it was intended not to mean." He says further of the action of the Anglican Bishops in the recent Lambeth Conference: "In 1920 they made a still further advance, to some of us very surprising (I confess I have not yet got over it) and gratifying and fairly breathing the very spirit of unity. They substituted these words, 'A ministry acknowledged in every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the Commission of Christ, and the authority of the whole body.' For a statement of questionable fact, they substitute a principle." He also refers to Principal Rainy, of the Scottish Presbyterian Church, who in his volume on the Ancient Catholic Church says, "It was felt that the whole Church should be represented and that this was especially the case in regard to ordination, because any organization of the ministry that does not represent the whole Church necessarily tends toward schism."

In a paper presented by the Congregational Commission at a preparatory conference of the World Conference, these three practical proposals were stated as follows: "(1) As concerns the ministry, a clergy so authenticated that without violation of the scruples of any, their standing may be regarded as regular by them all. (2) As regards the people, complete intercommunion of believers upon some agreed and orderly method of intercommunion. (3) So far as concern the ecclesiastical polities of the different churches, sufficient administrative unity to enable them, without loss of desirable home rule, to act as

a whole for the purposes of the whole." In the discussion of such proposals it should be kept constantly in mind, particularly in regard to additional authorization of the ministry by the conferring the orders of another, that the Lambeth proposals do not contemplate any reordination merely into the regular ministry of the Church of England. That is not so much as mentioned in their Appeal. What is contemplated is whatever Episcopal additional ordination, or confirmation of existing orders, may be required, without prejudice, for a common ministry in the whole Church having the authority of all.

VIII

The Providential Training of Congregationalism To Become a Maker of Peace

AS I look back to the beginnings of the history of Congregationalism and then behold what it has become now, I find myself impressed with the fact that it has been chosen and fashioned, as an instrument in the hand of the Lord, for the work to be done in this generation in making the peace of the churches and the world. From this point of view the history of this denomination might well be rewritten. The notes of this higher voice may be heard ever and anon in its literature; the signs of its high calling for this end are to be read at many a turn and cross-road along its way. It would require a volume to point out these providential signs along the way of our Congregational history.

At the conclusion of this narrative of what has been occurring during the past few years when one event has crowded upon another, I may only indicate in a few successive sentences the signs of this higher leading.

First. The history of Congregationalism began in the separation of a few individuals from the established Church of England. They held divers opinions among themselves, but they were agreed that they could not in good conscience continue in the worship of the Established Church.

Second. The chief leaders of this separation were well educated, trained in the universities.

Third. Going forth they had to find a dwelling place in the homes of the humble. They observed their communion in no church edifice, but in some room among the common people.

Fourth. They gave martyrs as the witness and seal of their faith.

Fifth. Notwithstanding, they were not willingly separatists; they denied that their separation was schism.

Sixth. They continued to cherish their inborn affection for the Church of England.

Seventh. From the first they not only met with oppositions from without, which bound them together, but likewise with dissensions from within to draw them apart. That was the next course of training for the ministry of reconciliation, which Providence set for them to learn; and it has taken them more than one generation to master it. How they argued and waged the warfare of the faithful,—is not this written in the books of the Chronicles of the Kings of our Israel? Nevertheless, in spite of fears from without and heresies from within, they kept together; and all the while the same Providence was welding them and fashioning them to be "a good instrument" for the greater work of faith to be done on the earth.

To what purpose then has been this providential call and training of Congregationalism for this present hour?

A few outcasts, holding their communions in humble cottages, pilgrims across the sea, one of the least of denominations, of divers opinions among themselves, owning no authority over them but their own conscience and the Word of the Lord, giving the first fruits of their fields for schools and colleges, as the Lord prospered them, sending their missionaries to the ends of the world,—for what now are they girded and called as one body to do?

The venerable Bishop, who misled others to reject our appeal in war times for a joint consecration of ministers of the whole Church of God, may not have heard of it; and in the seclusion of his own diocese he may have come to look upon us as a scattered flock of independent congregations, not to be trusted by the custodian of the ecclesiastical body safeguarded by a Constitution and some sixty-three and more canons, besides Bishops held in order by eight daily Orders,

and thirty-two General Orders, and twelve standing Orders,—to say nothing of the Constitutions and Rules of each particular diocese;—but this is what was done in the year 1917 by the Congregationalists,—it may be found in the records of the Regular Meetings of the National Council of the Congregational Churches.

"The Congregational Churches of the United States, by delegates in National Council assembled, reserving all the rights and cherished memories belonging to this organization under its former constitution and declaring the steadfast adherence of the churches composing the Council to the faith which our fathers confessed, which from age to age has found its expression in the historic creed of the Church universal and of this communion, and affirming our loyalty to the basic principles of our representative democracy, hereby set forth the things most surely believed among us concerning faith, polity and fellowship." Having made this confession in the faith of the whole Church, they proceeded to set forth in simple language understandable by the people the beliefs by all Christians deemed most essential. In defining their polity, they made this declaration under the heading, "The Wider Fellowship." "While affirming the liberty of our churches and the validity of our ministry, we hold to the unity and catholicity of the Church of Christ, and will unite with all its branches in hearty cooperation, and will earnestly seek, so far as in us lies, that the prayer of our Lord for His disciples may be answered, that they all may be one."

They then proceeded to reorganize their whole working polity, co-ordinating the various benevolent and educational societies, including a systematic plan of contributions for such agencies, the adoption of a sound insurance policy for the relief of aged or disabled ministers, appointed an Executive Committee with certain powers to act, consolidated their two denominational papers; and besides all this, provided that the Moderator of the Council shall continue in office from one Council to the next until his successor shall have been ap-

pointed. All this was accomplished by the unanimous vote of some five hundred delegates from their churches. It was done thoroughly and effectually after two years' work of its commission.

IX

Keeping by Giving

ONE obstacle to inter-church communion is the obligation which each denomination has felt to keep watch and guard over "the deposit of faith" committed to it. At every cross-road watchful sentinels are posted keen to detect any sound of approaching heresies. A little sensational alarm, of itself of passing significance, may arouse the denominational defenders of the faith from their slumbers, and set a whole church in commotion. But is heresy hunting, or hiding our own trust in the earth lest some adventurous passer-by may steal it from us, our Lord's way of keeping the faith?

How did He keep the divinity given Him of God from heaven? Was it not by giving it even to a touch on His garment? What meaning for our churches in their relations to each other may now be found in that saying of Jesus to His disciples, "In whatsoever measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you"? And again in those words to His disciples, "Freely ye have received, freely give"?

Thinking of this, my acquaintance with Bishop Weller of Fond du Lac had been so spiritually sincere and appreciative that I did not hesitate to write to him, just before the meeting of the Episcopal Convention, as I might not have presumed to do to another. In our letters we usually went below the mooted questions, seeking to get at the heart of things—with him I could have differences, indeed, but no controversy. The following extracts from this letter I put in print because they seem to me to go beneath the controversial lines which too long have separated us into opposing camps, and they may at least be suggestive of changes of front for leaders on both sides.

My dear Bishop Weller:

I think that I can understand what was lying back in your mind when you hesitated to use the word "efficient" with regard to the non-Episcopal ministration of the sacrament. But I realize, as you also would, what lies still deeper in our common Christian thought and devotion. The highest, most Christian thing,—is it not the sacrificial willingness to give of such as we have, as we may to others? Jesus did not withhold himself from any of his disciples because He could not give them all at once His divinity. May I then venture to suggest that just this Christlike method of self-impartation would be for all of us the truest Church polity of keeping our own "precious things," conserving by imparting as we may even to the least measure of another's faith? . . . In this crisis of Christianity for the world, if we fail of cooperating in real Church fellowship, we shall all of us share in the sinfulness of schism.

Pardon me then, if I venture to suggest that now a complete change of front on the side of the High Church party might command the situation, and at the same time secure the conservation of what you hold in trust, if, putting aside all controversy between us, you should boldly and avowedly offer to enter with us into the fellowship of a common ministry and communion. It often in our conferences and conversations has seemed to me that the Church extremes draw nearest each other; and that, if once brought into touch with each other, like positive and negative electricity, they might work together as one great Christian force.

Often in such conferences it has seemed to me, although our ecclesiastical points of view were separated, we ourselves were rather like men standing on opposite shores, between which seas were tossed by tumultuous winds, but we stood looking in the same direction where far out to sea the dawn of a new day was breaking on the horizon line.

X

A Personal Word to My Brethren in the Congregational Ministry

FOR thirteen years it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the Commission of the National Council of Congregational Churches on Federation, Comity and Unity and especially as one of a sub-committee to receive any overture from the Episcopal Church.

Since then at each successive meeting of the National Council we have made our reports. In publishing, as I now do, this narrative of what throughout these years we have sought to do and to venture, I desire to express my grateful appreciation of the confidence and support which have been given me, whatever differences of opinion may have at any time existed among us in our common desire to recover the fellowship of all the Churches of Christ. We do not forget that our forefathers were not originally in their own intention separatists. In one of the early Puritan pamphlets we read these words: "Peradventure you will say, we have broke the unity of the National Church, which we ought to have preserved. I answer we have but broke it by accident." If it has continued to remain broken by the accidents of history, so now should it be restored by the necessities of making Christianity the rule of the nations. In our own conferences and councils we do not forget that differences of opinions need not prevent us from communing together as certain ministers in London in the year 1656 in an agreement declared: "That where different principles lead to the same practice, we may join together in that practice, reserving to each of us our own principles."

During the past few years Prof. Williston Walker has

been a co-worker with me in all our correspondence and conferences with the Episcopalians. His clear wisdom and alert courage, combined with his serene faith have been to me a never failing support and reassurance. In going through the correspondence from which materials for this narrative have been drawn, I have felt as though he were still by my side—we still consulting together—and that I am carrying on, as best I may, his work also; so that I might say to his many pupils, he being dead, yet speaketh; and dedicate to his memory whatever is worthiest in these pages.

I may not refrain from expressing my profound conviction that a providential obligation will be laid upon our next National Council of making a great declaration, and by some practical act of committal taking our denominational place in the whole militant and triumphing Church of God. To my younger brethren in our ministry I would with confidence and a prophetic hope commit the completion of this work of which this narrative has recorded the beginnings.

At the meeting of the National Council in 1917 it was permitted to me to use these words in support of the new declaration which we made at that time of our progressive faith and polity: "It means that the Congregational Churches have a faith which they are not ashamed to confess and that they are not to lapse into a state of childlike creedlessness. . . . These creeds are not to be bound as fetters on the feet of progress; they are to be held aloft as banners, as we, like our fathers before us, go marching on as the Lord shall lead us into fuller knowledge of the love that passes knowledge. May the time never come when the Congregational Churches shall cease to affirm their right, and share and fellowship with all the saints in the Apostolic succession of the faith of the Holy Catholic Church throughout all the world."

Now that the crust of the old civilization is breaking up, and another springtime is coming both for state and church, the prospect opens before the ministry of a vaster field of service. Need any of us now fear to take up that old rallying cry of

one of our forefathers, "Reformation without tarrying for any"? Well may we heed this wise saying of another of our own prophets of old, "There is indeed danger of falling if we go forwards, and there is also danger if we fall backwards; as we read in the case of Eli of old, who fell backwards and brake his neck and he died."

Next October our National Council meets; what shall our answer to Lambeth be?

Appendix

I

A Preliminary Statement of a Joint Conference Held at Lambeth Palace

ON November 30, 1921, the Conference met at Lambeth Palace under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and after prolonged discussion appointed a committee of thirteen persons (six Church of England and six Free Churchmen) to consider, under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of York, some of the issues involving large questions of principle which had been raised during the Conference. This committee held prolonged meetings in Lambeth Palace in January, March and April, 1922, giving consideration chiefly to the three following subjects: (1) The nature of the Church; (2) The nature of the Ministry; (3) The place of creeds in a United Church. The committee ultimately decided to present their report in the form of a series of propositions to which they had unanimously agreed. The Conference met at Lambeth Palace on May 24, 1922, to receive the report. The report was considered, and after full discussion the Conference unanimously gave its general approval to the several propositions in the form printed below:

"It is obvious that many matters of great importance are not dealt with in this interim report. These must be the subject of future discussion. But the members of the Conference hope that the agreement which they have so far reached may prove to be a basis upon which, by God's help, further agreement leading to practical action may be built. Meanwhile, we would earnestly press upon all who have this great matter at heart that they should remember steadily, both in public and private

prayer, the possibilities of which, as we believe, God is opening to our view, in firm assurance that He will, in His own good time, show us the manner of their accomplishment."

RANDALL CANTUAR,
COSMO EBER,
J. D. JONES,
Moderator of the Federal Council.

May 29th, 1922.

I. ON THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

1. The foundation of the Church rests not upon the will or consent or beliefs of men, whether as individuals or as societies, but upon the creative Will of God.

2. The Church is the Body of Christ, and its constitutive principle is Christ Himself, living in His members through His Spirit.

3. As there is but one Christ, and one Life in Him, so there is and can be but one Church.

4. This one Church consists of all those who have been, or are being, redeemed by and in Christ, whether in this world or in the world beyond our sight, but it has its expression in this world in a visible form. Yet the Church, as invisible and as visible, is, by virtue of its own life in Christ, one.

5. This visible Church was instituted by Christ as a fellowship of men united with Him, and in Him with one another, to be His witness and His instrument in the spread of His Kingdom on earth.

6. As a visible Church it must possess certain visible and recognisable marks whereby it can be seen and known by men. These have been since the days of the Apostles at least the following: (a) The profession of faith in God as revealed and incarnate in Christ; (b) the observance of the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself; (c) an ideal of the Christian life protected by a common discipline; (d) a ministry, representative of the Church, for the preaching of the Word, the administration of the Sacraments, and the maintenance of the unity and continuity of the Church's witness and work. (See II, 1.)

7. Baptism is by the ordinance of Christ and of His Apostles the outward and visible sign of admission into membership of the Church.

8. The Church visible on earth ought to express and manifest to the world by its own visible unity the one Life in Christ of the one Body.

9. The true relation of the Church and local Churches is that which is described in the New Testament—namely, that the Churches are the local representatives of the One Church. The actual situation brought about in the course of history in which there are different and even rival denominational Churches independent of each other and existing together in the same locality, whatever justification arising out of historical circumstances may be claimed for these temporary separations, cannot be regarded as in accordance with the Purpose of Christ, and every endeavour ought to be made to restore the true position as set forth in the New Testament.

10. The marks which ought to characterise the Church visible on earth are possessed by these existing separate Churches and societies of Christian people in very varying degrees of completeness or defect. Hence, even though they be parts of the visible Church, they cannot be considered as all alike giving equally adequate expression to the Lord's Mind and Purpose. Some, indeed, may be so defective that they cannot rightly be judged to be parts of that Church. But such judgments, though made in trust that they are in accordance with the Divine Mind, must be regarded as limited to the sphere of the visible Church as an ordered society here on earth. It would be presumption to claim that they have a like validity in the sphere of the whole Church as the One Body of the redeemed in Christ, for within that sphere judgment can only be given by the All-knowing Mind and Sovereign Mercy of God.

II. The Ministry

1. A ministry of the Word and Sacrament is a Divine ordinance for the Church, and has been since the days of the Apostles an integral part in its organised life.

2. It is a ministry within the Church exercising representatively, in the Name and by the authority of the Lord Who is the Head of the Church, the powers and functions which are inherent in the Church.

3. It is a ministry of the Church, and not merely of any part thereof.

4. No man can take this ministry upon himself. It must be conferred by the Church, acting through those who have authority given to them in the Church to confer it. There must be not only an inward call of the Spirit, but also an outward and visible call and commission by the Church.

5. It is in accordance with Apostolic practice and the ancient custom of the Church that this commission should be given through Ordination, with prayer and the laying-on of hands by those who have authority given to them to ordain.

6. We believe that in Ordination, together with this commission to minister, Divine Grace is given through the Holy Spirit in response to prayer and faith for the fulfilment of the charge so committed.

7. Within the many Christian Communions into which in the course of history Christendom has been divided, various forms of ministry have grown up according to the circumstances of these several Communions and their beliefs as to the Mind of Christ and the guidance of the New Testament. These various ministries of Word and Sacrament have been, in God's providence, manifestly and abundantly used by the Holy Spirit in His work of "enlightening the world, converting sinners, and perfecting saints." But the differences which have arisen with regard to the authority and functions of these various forms of ministry have been and are the occasion of manifold doubts, questions, and misunderstandings. For the allaying of doubts and scruples in the future, and for the more perfect realisation of the truth that the ministry is a ministry of the Church, and not merely of any part thereof, means should be provided for the United Church which we desire, whereby its ministry may be acknowledged by every part thereof as possessing the authority of the whole body.

8. In view of the fact that the Episcopate was from early times and for many centuries accepted, and by the greater part of Christendom is still accepted, as the means whereby this authority of the whole body is given, we agree that it ought to be accepted as such for the United Church of the future.

9. Similarly, in view of the place which the Council of Presbyters and the Congregation of the faithful had in the constitution of the early Church, and the preservation of these elements of presbyteral and congregational order in large sections of Christendom, we agree

that they should be maintained with a representative and constitutional Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the United Church.

10. The acceptance of Episcopal Ordination for the future would not imply the acceptance of any particular theory as to its origin or character, or the disowning of past ministries of Word and Sacrament otherwise received, which have, together with those received by Episcopal Ordination, been used and blessed by the Spirit of God.

III. The Place of the Creed in a United Church

1. In a united Church there must be unity of Faith, which implies both the subjective element of personal adhesion and an objective standard of truth.

2. The supreme standard of truth is the revelation of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as summed up in Jesus Christ.

3. As the Church in its corporate capacity confesses Christ before men, there should be in the United Church a formal statement of its corporate faith in Christ as an expression of what is intellectually implied by its confession of Him.

4. The Creed commonly called Nicene should be accepted by the United Church as the sufficient statement of this corporate faith. The manner and occasions in which the Creed is to be used should be determined by the United Church.

5. With regard to a confession of faith at Baptism, the United Church would be justified in using the Creed which has been for centuries the Baptismal Creed of the Western Church, commonly called the Apostles' Creed. Its use at Baptism would imply recognition of the corporate faith of the Church therein expressed as the guide and inspiration of the Christian life.

6. The use of the Creeds liturgically in the public worship of the Church should be regarded as an expression of corporate faith and allegiance; and the United Church should be prepared to recognise diversities of use in this as in other liturgical customs.

7. When assent to the Creeds is required by the United Church, such assent should not be understood to imply the acceptance of them as a complete expression of the Christian Faith, or as excluding reasonable liberty of interpretation. It should be understood to imply

the acceptance of them as agreeable to the Word of God contained in the Holy Scriptures, as affirming essential elements in the Christian Faith, and as preserving that Faith in the form in which it has been handed down through many centuries in the history of the Christian Church.

8. While we thus recognise the rightful place of the Creeds in the United Church, we also recognise most fully and thankfully the continued Presence and Teaching of the Living Spirit in His Body, and emphasise the duty of the Church to keep its mind free and ready to receive from Him in each day and generation ever-renewed guidance in the apprehension and expression of the truth.

II

The Concordat, Canon II

(Adopted by the General Convention of the Episcopal Church, September, 1922)

OF THE ORDINATION OF DEACONS AND PRIESTS IN SPECIAL CASES

Of Ministers Who Have Not Received Episcopal Ordination

Section I. In case any Minister who has not received episcopal ordination shall desire to receive such orders from a Bishop of this Church to the Diaconate and to the Priesthood without giving up or denying his fellowship or his ministry in the Communion to which he belongs, the Bishop of the Diocese or Missionary District in which he lives, with the advice and consent of the Standing Committee or the Council of Advice, may confirm and ordain him; provided, also, that the congregation, if any, in which such Minister officiates, shall declare, through its proper representatives, its desire for such ordination on behalf of its Minister, and its purpose to receive in future the ministrations and the Sacraments of one who shall be ordained to the Priesthood by a Bishop.

Pre-ordination Requirements

Section II. The Minister desiring to be so ordained shall satisfy the Bishop that he has resided in the United States at least one year; that he has been duly baptized with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; that he holds

the historic faith of the Church as contained in the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed; that there is no sufficient objection on grounds physical, mental, moral or spiritual; that the Ecclesiastical Authority to which he is subject in the Communion to which he belongs consents to such ordination; that he will not knowingly admit to the Holy Communion any person who has not been baptized with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; and further, the Bishop shall charge him that the Church hopefully anticipates the use of the Apostolic practice of Confirmation among his people.

Declarations, Undertakings and Agreements Required

Section III. At the time of such ordination the person so to be ordained shall subscribe and make in the presence of the Bishop a declaration that he believes the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God and to contain all things necessary to salvation; that in the ministration of Baptism he will unfailingly baptize with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. He shall also undertake that in the celebration of the Holy Communion he will invariably use the elements of bread and wine, and will include in the service (a) a Prayer of Consecration, embodying the words and acts of our Lord in the Institution of the Sacrament, an Offering, an Invocation of the Holy Spirit and a Thanksgiving, (b) the Lord's Prayer, and (c) the Apostles' Creed or the Nicene Creed as the symbol of the faith and unity of the Holy Catholic Church. He shall also agree that when thereto invited by the Bishop of this Church having jurisdiction in the place where he lives, he will (unless unavoidably prevented) meet with such Bishop for Holy Communion and for counsel and co-operation; and that he will hold himself answerable to the Bishop of this Church having jurisdiction in the place where he lives, or, if there be no such Bishop, to the Presiding Bishop of this Church, in case he be called in question with respect to error of faith or of conduct.

Procedure in Case of Trial

Section IV. In case a person so ordained be charged with error of faith or of conduct he shall have reasonable notice of the charge and reasonable opportunity to be heard, and the procedure shall be similar to the procedure in the case of a Clergyman of this Church

charged with the like offense. The sentence shall always be pronounced by the Bishop and shall be such as a Clergyman of this Church would be liable to. It shall be certified to the Ecclesiastical Authority to which the defendant is responsible in any other Communion. If he shall have been tried before a tribunal of the Communion in which he has exercised his ministry, the judgment of such tribunal proceeding in the due exercise of its jurisdiction shall be taken as conclusive evidence of facts thereby adjudged.

Conditions of Officiating and Restrictions

Section V. A Minister so ordained may officiate according to the prescribed order of this Church, in a Diocese or Missionary District of this Church when licensed by the Ecclesiastical Authority thereof, but he shall not become the Rector or a Minister of any Parish or Congregation of this Church until he shall have subscribed and made to the Ordinary a declaration in writing, whereby he shall solemnly engage to conform to the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of this Church. Upon his making such declaration and being duly elected Rector or Minister of a Parish or Congregation of this Church, and complying with the Canons of this Church and of the Diocese or Missionary District in that behalf, he shall become for all purposes a Minister of this Church.

Section VI. In this Canon the action to be taken by a Bishop is limited to that of the Bishop of a Diocese or Missionary District, having jurisdiction therein.

III

The Historical Succession of Conferences on Church Unity

ONE of the significant facts of Church history since the Reformation, to which, however, the Church histories have paid little attention, is the succession of conferences for reunion. The only history of all these conferences, so far as I know, is a German publication of two volumes entitled *Attempts towards Church Union* (*Kirchlichen Union Versuchen*) *from the Reformation to the Present Time* (1836),

C. W. Hering. It contains full accounts drawn from documentary sources of all such important conferences, as notably that at Thorn of both Catholic and Protestant representatives, in which detailed reports of the speeches made at the sessions of the Conference are reported. These volumes are to be found in the Yale University Library. They contain not only narratives of the proceedings of such conferences, but also accounts of the individual endeavors and writings which contributed to them. A glance through these volumes is enough to show how continuously throughout these centuries of controversies and separations, efforts for happier relations among the churches have not been wanting. The Church not only has inherited the controversies of the past; but this history of makers of peace from generation to generation is also our inheritance; and its fulfilment our obligation to the past,—God having provided some better thing for us that they without us should not be made perfect. (An account of some of these "Historical Materials for Present Uses" has been published in the volume on *Approaches towards Unity,* Yale University Press, by Smyth and Walker.)

IV

Three Recent Books

BISHOP GORE'S second edition of *The Church and the Ministry;* Canon Arthur C. Headlam's *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion;* L. J. Walker's *The Problem of Reunion.*

The second edition of now Bishop Headlam's volume contains a reply to Bishop Gore's criticism of it as well as Mr. Turner's review. It is based on the results of critical studies of the origins of divisions and the doctrine of the Church. In no single volume can so much scholarly material for intelligent discussion of the problems of reunion be found. The volume by L. J. Walker, S.J., is a remarkably irenical discussion of the problems of reunion from the Roman Catholic point of view.

His extended account of the existing relation among Protestant churches and their problems of reunion is not only intelligent and fair, but it contains much well worth our consideration. His view of the possibilities of reunion among the Protestant Churches is instructive, and his assertion that the High, or as he calls them the "advanced Catholics" of the Church of England, hold a position which is utterly irreconcilable with Rome, is, to say the least, interesting. For any who would really understand the best thought in the Roman Catholic Church to-day this book is to be commended.

CONCERNING THE CREED

The following account has been sent to me by Bishop Lines, of New Jersey.

Rev. Dr. A. C. Headlam, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford and Bishop-Designate of Gloucester, preaching in London just now upon the replies of Rev. Dr. Selbie and Rev. Dr. Scott Lidget to the Lambeth Conference Report, expresses himself in ways which interested me greatly, as generous and thoughtful utterances on the subject of "Barriers to Unity."

Dr. Selbie had said that in the Congregational Church there has always been very great reluctance to impose Creeds upon anyone, that "the Nicene Creed is as good as any for the present" discussion of the place of a Creed, "but it will not do to make them impositions upon any."

Dr. Lidgett had said that one of the chief causes of Christian disunion has been the over elaboration of dogmatic statements, but that we must unite together on one faith, with balance of judgment and with reasonable ground for thinking that the great body of our people accept that faith.

Dr. Headlam suggests this solution:

> We should recognise that the basis of union must be the acceptance of the faith of Christ. We are not Christians because we believe the Nicene Creed, but because we believe the faith which is expressed in the Nicene Creed. Therefore I would suggest that we take, as the terms of our faith, assent to the creeds, something of this sort: "We

accept the faith of Christ as it is taught in the Holy Scriptures, and as it has been handed down to us in the Creed of the Church." If you were to call upon everyone to make some such declaration as that, you would be securing the unity of our faith, leaving full freedom for interpretation, and would take care that the emphasis was not on this or that particular document, but that the emphasis was on the faith of Christ, which is something for our heart and conscience as well as our intellect.

There is hardly a theologian in the English Church to-day more highly regarded for great learning combined with practical judgment.

This suggestion of Bishop Headlam is in accordance with the declaration of faith adopted by the national Congregational Council in 1917. It also agrees with the following statement of the basis of the World Conference, which was adopted by the North American Preparatory Conference in 1916 as follows:

"The basis of the proposed World Conference is the faith of the whole Church, as created by Christ, resting on the Incarnation and continued from age to age by His Life until He comes." Such declaration of the faith of the whole Church not only recognizes the historic continuity of the faith of the Church from the Apostolic times, but also it recognizes the fulfilment from age to age of the promise of the Spirit to lead the disciples into all truth. This leaves to enlightened scholarship the historic interpretation of creeds.

V

Concerning the Inter-communion of Believers

A MOST valuable part of Bishop Headlam's contribution to Reunion is the portion of his book in which he treats of the Eucharist,—"The Holy Communion was intended to be the great Christian Sacrament of unity."

His presentation of the Sacrament of unity, taken as a whole, is at once so clear, so simply thorough and convincing, that I hesitate to quote from it single striking sentences,—it should

be read and thought over as a whole. These few single sentences may serve to indicate its scope and significance. He defines his object in these three main propositions. First, that the emphasis on the particular form of belief in the Eucharist is quite contrary to all the feelings and beliefs of the undivided Christian Church. Secondly, that the chief cause of division between different bodies of Christians has been the attempt to make dogmatic systems on questions of Eucharistic belief. And, thirdly, that the only hope of Christian union is not on any formula to which all may agree, but in recognizing that all can join in accepting a common Liturgical worship, for so far as worship is concerned, there is—if men would only look at what they believe, and not at what they do not believe—among all devout minds, a real and genuine common ground of belief. "There is a heritage, but it is not a defined doctrine, it is one of Eucharistic worship. All the Liturgies are perfectly consistent with almost any attempt to define Eucharistic doctrine. So long as the Church avoided definition there was little discussion on the Eucharist, but Eucharistic worship was the center of all Church life. And if it is, as a matter of fact, in our Liturgy that the Church of England unites, it is, I believe, in its Liturgies alone that the Christian Church will ever be able to unite. All alike, the Liturgies in everything that is essential are older than our controversies."

But such fragmentary quotations only express the intention and hope of the whole. In confirmation of it I may add the following extract from the letter of a group of Priests at Rome to Pope Pius X, entitled, "What We Want" (translated by A. L. Lilley, John Murray, 1907):

"So again, to explain the Eucharistic Mystery, we cannot, for similar reasons, adopt the theory of transubstantiation, unless no one is to understand. But we will say that the faithful, after the words of consecration, while with the senses of their bodily life they will see only bread and wine, will yet with the soul, by means of a superphenomenal experience—of faith, in short,—be in contact with the real and living Christ, Who,

before he died, gathered his disciples to a fraternal feast to communicate to them for the last time the 'Bread of Eternal Life'—will be in contact with the Christ suspended upon the Cross, the Victim of justice and of peace" (p. 42).

VI

Some Words from the Past for Present Uses

IT is now generally known that the bloody hate of Christendom, for the amelioration of which human wisdom can discover no means, which daily grows worse and worse, flows from no other source than the disunity of religion." Wladislav IV, King of Poland, 1645.

"It will then doubtless be far from us, so to attest the discipline of Christ, as to detest the disciples of Christ: so to contend for the seamless coat of Christ, as to crucify the living members of Christ: so to divide ourselves about Church communion, as through breaches to open a wide gap for a deluge of Antichristian & profane malignity to swallow up both Church and civil state.

"What shall we say more? is difference about church order become the inlet of all the disorders in the kingdom? hath the Lord indeed left us to such hardness of heart, that Church government shall become a snare to Zion, (as sometimes Moses was to Egypt, Exod. 10.7.) that we cannot leave contesting and contending about it, till the kingdom be destroyed? did not the Lord Jesus, when he dedicated his sufferings for his church and his also unto his father, make it his earnest and only prayer for us in this world, that we might be one in him? John 17, 20, 21, 22, 23. And is it possible, that he, (whom the Father heard always, John 11, 42.) should not have had this last most solemn prayer heard, and granted? or, shall it be granted for all the saints elsewhere, and not for the saints in England; so that amongst them disunion shall grow even about

church union. and communion? If it is possible, for a little faith (so much as a grain of mustard seed) to remove a mountain: is it not possible, for so much strength of faith, as is to be found in all the godly in the kingdom, to remove those Images of jealousy, and to cast those stumbling blocks out of the way, which may hinder the free passage of brotherly love amongst brethren." From the Preface to the Cambridge Platform, 1648.

"We have endeavored throughout, to hold such Truths in this our Confession, as are more properly termed matters of Faith, and what is of Church order, we dispose in certain propositions by itself. . . . There being nothing that tends more to heighten dissentings among brethren, than to determine and adopt the matter of their difference, under so high a title, as to be an article of our Faith." Preface to the Savoy Declaration, 1658.

"It is not the variety of opinions, but our own perverse wills, who think it meet that all should be conceited as we are, which hath so inconvenienced the church; were we not ready to anathematize each other, which we concur not in opinion, we might in hearts be united though in tongues we were divided, and that with singular profit to all sides. It is the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and not identity of conceit, which the Holy Ghost requires at the hands of Christians. Since it is impossible where Scripture is ambiguous that all conceits should run alike, it remains that we should seek out a way not so much to establish an unity of opinion in the minds of all, which I take to be a thing likewise impossible, as to provide that multiplicity of conceits trouble not the church's peace." From the Golden Remains of the Ever Memorial Mr. John Hales of Eton College.

The primitive use of the word Catholic, Ignatius Ep. to the Smyrnæans, ch. XIII.

WHEREVER JESUS CHRIST IS, THERE IS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

W9-AQD-210